

PS
PSYCHOLOGICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

APR 21 1949

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW

EDITOR: LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

APRIL 1949

Price 4s.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL COMMENTS, by Leslie F. Church, B.A., Ph.D.

ARTICLES

Before and after 'Amsterdam', C. Ryder Smith, B.A., B.D.

The Creative Element in the Thought of Jesus, Vincent Taylor, D.D., Ph.D.

The Problem of Demon-Possession, Leslie D. Weatherhead, M.A., D.D.

The Two Isaacs: Newton, 1642-1727, Watts, 1674-1748, F. Brompton Harvey

One of our Conquerors (conclusion), W. S. Handley Jones

Christian Initiation: Some recent Anglican Discussion, B.M. G. Reardon, M.A.

The Place of James Thomson in the Poetry of Nature,
W. Lamplough Doughty, B.A., B.D.

The Oxyrhynchus Sayings of Jesus: Observation as to Source,
Leon Edw. Wright, S.T.B., Ph.D.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

Education: A 'High Word' or a 'Byword'?, Charles Gimblett, M.A.

Christian Education, J. E. Parry, M.A. B.Litt.

RECENT LITERATURE, Edited by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.

FROM MY NEW SHELF, C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

LONDON
THE EPWORTH PRESS
FRANK H. CUMBERS
25 - 35 · CITY ROAD · E.C.1

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review

LITERATURE HISTORY SOCIOLOGY
RELIGION THEOLOGY PHILOSOPHY

Editor: LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review is published on the 25th of March, June, September, and December by the Epworth Press, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1. It may be obtained from the publishers or any bookseller at 4s. 6d. copy (postage 3d.) or 15s. per annum, post free.

All contributions (typewritten, if possible), should be addressed to The Editor, 'The London Quarterly and Holborn Review', 25-35 City Road, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.

The New Outlook on Child Care

- There has been a marked change in recent years in the attitude to the problem of children deprived of a normal home life. The National Children's Home welcomes this awakening of public interest, for it has pioneered the cause of these little people for the past eighty years.
- Though National in name, the Home is not nationalised and relies on voluntary support for most of its income. Please help us to carry on.

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME

CHIEF OFFICES: Highbury Park, London, N.5

Editorial Comments

THE TRIALS IN HUNGARY AND BULGARIA

HISTORY will record its final verdict on the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, but no man can yet say what such verdict will be. Fierce resentment has been countered by an official defence of the legal procedure. This would have been more convincing had it not been preceded by the curt refusal to admit certain Western 'eye-witnesses' who have been able to vindicate the action of any normal court of justice. The 'confession' of the Cardinal remains a mystery, and world opinion is coloured by the gravest doubts. In any attempt to assess the charges brought against the Cardinal in Hungary or the Protestant pastors in Bulgaria it must be obvious that there is a sharp distinction between criticism of a new régime and professional espionage. It could hardly be expected that Christian leaders would calmly sanction some of the revolutionary changes that were so suddenly effected. It may be that positive criticisms became, in the eyes of a newly established Government, serious indiscretions, but one questions whether many of the men concerned were capable of the subtleties of international espionage, and it is difficult to believe that they were guilty of base treachery which is sustained by the hope of large financial reward. Many of the 'secrets' they were alleged to have sold were facts available in books and periodicals on the bookstalls!

At the moment our chief concern is to do all that is possible to prevent religious leaders in Hungary or Bulgaria being lured into a movement corresponding to that of the 'German Christians', one of Hitler's subtlest attempts to create a puppet Church.

Once again Christians in many countries are faced with the choice 'Caesar or Christ' and it may well be that the whole Christian Church will be compelled to stake life itself in making its witness. In this sense the twentieth century is nearer the first century than many people yet realize. No true Christian can accept the formula that his supreme loyalty is loyalty to the State. When once that is admitted the conception of God becomes a mockery.

THE CHILDREN'S TOWN AT HAJDUHADHAZ¹

The nationalization of schools in Hungary has resulted, according to the official Hungarian Information Service, in 'the unification of the educational system, the improvement of the status of teachers and . . . the introduction of new text-books'. Most of the schools were under the control of the Roman Catholic Church, and it is maintained by the exponents of the new scheme that

¹ *New Ways in Hungarian Education—Hungarian Bulletin*, Zoltanutca 6, Budapest V.

seventy-three per cent. of the adult population left school before they were ten years of age. To quote from the official *Bulletin*: 'While many new schools are being built, over one hundred and twenty abandoned castles and country houses have been turned into resident schools for children formerly dispersed around widely-scattered villages. Nationalization of the schools did not mean the suppression of religious teaching. On the contrary, religious instruction in the schools remains compulsory.'

Such a statement sounds promising, but it must be remembered it is an account of what is merely the *first instalment* of the new scheme. One rejoices in every reasonable attempt to raise the standard of education, but it would be folly to pronounce any final judgement on the movement in Hungary until the preliminary stages are passed and the permanent pattern emerges. Already some of the experiments show the great difference between our own ideals and those of the present Hungarian Government.

In 1946 a Report issued by the Ministry of Public Welfare revealed the appalling conditions brought about by the war. Nearly a million children were starving and almost naked. Shoes were a luxury. 'Over sixty thousand little orphans roamed the countryside living on alms, on gifts of food, and sometimes on stealing. At best they helped themselves by performing small jobs which were, of course, badly paid.' Babies were wrapped in rags or newspapers, and more than forty thousand children from three to six years of age could not go to school because they had not a single garment to wear. The rate of child mortality and the increase in juvenile crime were terrifying.

The first steps toward recovery were taken in 1945 and were made possible largely through the help offered by such relief organizations as the Danish Red Cross, the Swedish Red Cross, Don Suisse, U.N.R.R.A., the Save the Children Fund, and the Society of Friends. A derelict military camp in a forest near Debrecen was transformed into a centre for children, abandoned and desolate. At first the furniture was made out of the packing-cases in which food and other necessities had come from many countries. Presently the work was extended and the Ministry of Public Welfare created the Children's Town of Hajduhadhaz. It had its own town hall, police station, post office, library, schools, cinema, concert hall, and workshops. There were also playing-pitches, a hospital, and a farm. The people of Budapest helped to install sanitation, power plants, and other public services. So far, the account issued by the *Hungarian Bulletin* suggests that the physical needs of these children have been met. It is difficult to feel the same approval of the rest of the Report:

'What is original and daring in this Children's Town is its "political", administrative, and financial system. Under the guidance of Dr. Zsigmond Ádám, well-known pedagogist, aided by a group of educators who leave most of the decisions to the children themselves, the town is administered by a body

ected by secret ballot by all the citizens of the town being ten years of age at least. Thus the Municipal Council consists only of children—the mayor is a boy of sixteen. . . .’ On the same principle the General Assembly like the Council carries out ‘the projects evolved by the children’ without intervention by adults except for what the *Bulletin* naïvely describes as ‘eventual help’. The police chief, judges, policemen, postmen, and the President of the Court are all elected by secret ballot, with a franchise extended to the ten-year-olds. The Court of Justice is run entirely by children, and the adults remain content to see the sentences are duly carried out.

What are described as the ‘principal paragraphs’ of the laws of this astonishing community read solemnly enough as the product of little children and teen-agers:

1. We must respect, love and help one another.
2. One should not leave a collective game or job without giving a reason for it.
3. All work or games endangering the health and physical integrity of anyone is forbidden.
4. We must not swear, annoy others, or inform on one another.
5. We shall work diligently and honestly at school and in the workshops.
6. We shall pay attention to the cleanliness of our room, our bed, our house, our body and our speech.

When delinquents are brought before the Court, they may receive any of the following sentences:

1. Withholding of rewards.
2. Withholding of special rewards.
3. Exclusion from games.
4. Public scolding.
5. Having to perform a disagreeable job for a certain period of time.
6. Bad classification.
7. Reparations. For instance, having to suffer the consequences of the crime committed.
8. Having to appear before the body of educators.
9. Having to appear before the director.
10. Exclusion from the Town.

There is no corporal punishment. On the other hand satisfactory ‘citizens’ may receive ‘open praise before a certain group or before the entire town, recommendation for a confidential post, gift of books, chocolate, or a small sum of money.’

Except in the case of the ‘gift of chocolate’ one reads the account and forgets the natural characteristics of childhood altogether. It seems to be a description of adult life, and a regimentation, so severe, that humour must be unusual—perhaps reprehensible. By contrast one recalls a farmer in Ulster who had

been disturbed by the local boys who had climbed the gate that led to his orchard and taken some of the apples—not, of course for a black market, but for immediate consumption, almost on the premises! He felt he must take action, and wrote a notice which he pinned to the gate. It said tersely: 'God help those who help themselves', and it was effective!

'The life of the Children's Town is divided into three fields of activity,' says the *Bulletin*, 'study and the apprenticeship for a certain skill—work which constitutes a direct participation in the economic life of the town—and the sports and cultural occupations.'

In spite of the stilted language one realizes that there are many admirable features in this attempt to help the child to recover from the wounds the war inflicted on body and mind. On the other hand, one trembles to think that the future of the world is to be entrusted to those who are so disciplined and directed that they miss the priceless gift of childhood. It is difficult to imagine the man of forty or sixty who, at ten, was solemnly considering his participation in the economic life of the community. By all means let us teach good citizenship, but let us leave a few years for the careless rapture of childhood and boyhood. Is it not true that we may know too much too soon—too much of the mechanism of society and too little of the beauty and truth and goodness of the dawn of life which is infinite and eternal because it is part of God's dream, rather than a blue-print to be used in an industrial or economic process?

The most astonishing thing is that in a description of what is, in some ways, an interesting experiment, there is no single mention of the words, parent, father, mother, nor of Church, still less of God.

PROPAGANDA

The modern machinery of propaganda has become complicated and efficient to an astonishing degree. Unfortunately, the world is unequally equipped and many a good cause may be lost because its pioneers have neither the financial resources nor the apparatus to 'put over' their case. Whatever may be the final issue of the Palestine problem, it is clear that the cause of Israel has been presented far more competently and more constantly than the Arab case. In an age when all men of good-will hope that future differences will be settled in the council-chamber rather than on the battle-field it is extremely important that any problem that is considered should be presented fully, and that a case should not be lost because of inadequate evidence or faulty interpretation. If the world is to become democratic it is obvious that the machinery of propaganda must be available to all.

At the same time it is even more necessary that mankind shall develop a new respect for truth, and that propaganda shall be used to educate men in a knowledge of true and eternal values.

The dictionary-makers define propaganda as 'a name generally given to those institutions by means of which Christianity is propagated in heathen countries, more particularly to an association, the congregation *de propaganda fide* (for propagating the faith) established at Rome by Pope Gregory the Fifteenth in 1662.' In the eighteenth century the same word was chosen in England by those brave souls who established the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.

Today the development of transport, of printing, and above all of wireless communication has extended the range of propaganda services beyond the wildest dreams of our fathers and forefathers. Unfortunately, these new possibilities carry with them great dangers. The insidious lie 'over the air' is not so easily exposed as is false evidence in a court of law, or even an untruthful report in the Press. One of the most important responsibilities of the good citizen is to help to preserve standards of truth in all propaganda, and to secure, as far as may be, a fair hearing for both sides.

The efficient and well-presented information services that send their literature to every editorial office are a revelation of the case being given in certain continental countries to political theories that, to say the least of them, are entirely foreign to the English tradition, and in many cases completely ruthless and materialistic. No effort on our part should be spared to preserve the integrity of our witness to the spiritual values by which we have been accustomed to assess our lives, and the spiritual foundations on which the contribution of our nation to the great family of peoples has been and still must be made.

THE CELTIC CHURCH

It is an unfortunate fact that the average Englishman associates the introduction of Christianity to England with the name of St. Augustine. He is astonished at any reference to the British Church, and is, generally speaking, completely ignorant of the valiant missionary activities of Ninian, Patrick, David, Kentigern, and their associates. The critical work of Dr. W. D. Simpson and Dr. Archibald B. Scott is not as widely known as it ought to be. Still less is the ordinary layman in the Church familiar with Gildas, Bede, Palladius or Sulpicius Severus. For this reason, amongst others, we welcome the admirable survey of the history of the Celtic Church recently written by Diana Leatham.¹ Writing so easily that the ordinary reader is gripped by the fascinating story, she neither dismisses the miraculous with a sneer nor accepts it without question. Instead, she reminds us that the earliest sources are scanty and that later material is often coloured by the period in which it was written. Even the sophisticated critic of today will find himself unable to deny the reality of these spiritual adventures. It is one thing to consider a medieval account of a simple incident in the life of St. Patrick or St. Brendan and dismiss it with a smile, but

¹ *They Built on Rock*, Diana Leatham, The Celtic Art Society (Glasgow, 15s. net).

it is entirely another to follow the links in a chain that stretches from Polycarp, if not John of Ephesus, to the last grim chapter describing the Danish desolation. The courage of the martyrs of Lyons and Vienne, and the valour of the monks of Pachomius in the Egyptian deserts helped to make possible the unfailing Christian witness in the Dark Ages.

In this fascinating book, Diana Leatham describes the closely linked succession of Celtic saints—from St. Martin of Tours to St. Cuthbert—as 'valiant, lovable, and above all, alive'.

Here is a great missionary story, which will come as a revelation to people for whom Christianity in England began in Kent at the end of the sixth century. The carefully selected, and wisely curtailed, bibliographies at the end of each chapter will, we hope, guide many readers to a wider study of this important subject. In this pagan world of today, the faith and works of these very human and practical saints are an inspiration.

The book is excellently illustrated by J. H. Miller and the production, as we should expect from the Celtic Art Society, is a sheer delight. We feel that such a work is a definite contribution to the struggle which is becoming more sharply defined between the dark hosts of materialism, and the family of God.

LESLIE F. CHURCH

Articles

BEFORE AND AFTER 'AMSTERDAM'

AMSTERDAM' seems likely to be the mother of many books. This is as it should be, for a World Council of Churches would fail fundamentally if it were an 'end in itself'. These four volumes¹ are the first of a series. They represent the work done *before* 'Amsterdam', for it was rightly recognized that much of the success of such an Assembly depends upon careful and prolonged preparation. The next volume, 'The Official Assembly Report', is already promised us, and there is much other work afoot as a sequel to 'Amsterdam'. The four volumes have now been long enough in hand for some estimate to be made of their value. Each is the product of the work of a Commission. So far as possible each Commission consisted of 'leading Christians, both clerical and lay, from various parts of the world'. Unfortunately, in consequence of the unhappy state of 'world affairs', it did not prove possible to secure many contributions from the Churches of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. There are none from Russia itself, and there is only one from the influential group of Russian scholars that centres in Paris. Of forty-one contributors sixteen come from the Continent and nineteen from the English-speaking lands. The country of Grotius appropriately supplies two studies in law. The United States and this country have almost equal shares. It is claimed, perhaps rightly, that the small number of contributions from the younger Churches has not greatly disturbed the results. Certainly care has been taken to secure, as far as may be, a 'common mind'. Each of the Commissions worked for more than two years in anticipation of the Assembly. When the experts to whom various subjects had been assigned had written first drafts, these were circulated, considered, and criticized, by the writer's colleagues on the Commission, and then revised and sometimes rewritten. Each Commission drew up an agreed Report, and submitted it to the Assembly. The latter 'received' the Report, but did not 'adopt' it, preferring to 'commend it to the Churches for their serious consideration and appropriate action'. In other words 'Before Amsterdam' leads, as it should, to 'After Amsterdam'. When the Assembly closed, those who had been there said two things about it. The first was that the Holy Spirit was unmistakably present. This statement is very brief, but ultimately, unless this can be said, the whole 'ecumenical movement' is vain; so long as it can be said of gathering after gathering, ultimate success is sure. The other statement ran: 'Do not expect too much of Amsterdam!' It was a necessary warning, for today many Christians, following the world's lead, are often impatient of any but 'quick returns'. One may still ask, however, whether something more might have been hoped for, if not expected, from the long preparation for the Assembly. While recognizing the excellence of *every* contribution, the present writer has reluctantly to admit that, when he opened the volumes, he looked for something more than

¹ *The Universal Church in God's Design. The Church's Witness to God's Design. The Church and the Disorder of Society. The Church and the International Disorder.* (S.C.M., 42s. the set; 12s. 6d. each volume).

he has found. If the parable is not too homely, he is like a man who is grateful for fifteen shillings, but had hoped for a sovereign. It will probably be more serviceable to spend space on the five shillings than on the fifteen—but this does not mean that the fifteen are not very welcome. At the end, something will be said about the chief contribution of the volumes in the realm of immediate need.

The general title of the four volumes is *Man's Disorder and God's Design*. It will be seen that the titles of the individual volumes add a third subject to these two, 'the Church'. Instead of treating each volume separately, it will be convenient to say something of each of these three subjects in turn, keeping an eye sometimes on 'the time to come' as well as on the volumes themselves. It goes without saying that the three subjects cannot always be kept apart.

Man's Disorder is, of course, a very wide subject, for what is there in human life that sin has not disordered? This is always so, but in periods of crisis like the present disorder is peculiarly rife and catastrophic. There is obvious and abundant disorder in politics and economics, in family life and education, in amusement and luxury, in literature and in 'propaganda', in both fine and useful art, and so on. It is to be expected that in course of time the World Council will face all these kinds of disorder. For instance, the need for a Christian Aesthetic is clamant. Like the rest of life within Western Christendom it broke loose from the control of the Church at the Renaissance, and since then the Church has done little to face up to the consequences. Of course the subject is very difficult, but the business of the Church is with the difficult. Most thoughtful Christians are agreed that 'Nature is sacramental' and that 'all work ought to be sacramental'. The two doctrines unite under art. Similar reasons might be urged why the Christian way should be sought in meeting all the other disorders of mankind, but in preparing for Amsterdam the Committee, while not altogether ignoring other disorders, rightly concentrated on the economic and political. Here, however, there is a peculiar difficulty. During the last generation this ground has been covered again and again by some of the most acute minds in the several Churches, and, broadly speaking, they have reached the same conclusions. Tracing the proximate cause of the present distress to the Renaissance, they unite in finding the ground of our ills in 'Humanism' and its assumption that man is sufficient unto himself. Within this frame-work they have described and denounced such things as Totalitarianism, the Capitalist System, the concept of inevitable progress, the submission of men to machines, and so on. It was necessary that the Reports of the Commissions should contain an account of man's political and economic disorder, and the subject was rightly assigned to a particular group of contributors. Unfortunately, however, other writers too have felt that they must say a good deal on the subject. In consequence there is considerable repetition, and space is given to diagnosis that might have been spared for prescription. And, when all is read, it will be found that the Reports say little or nothing that had not already been said and well said. Under *Man's Disorder* the Reports do little more than 'mark time'. An illustration of what is meant may be given. In many of the earlier diagnoses of Humanism it has almost been treated as though it were *wholly* evil. There begin already to be protests that there is a *Christian* Humanism and that

Christian Humanists have had some considerable influence in the last five centuries. For instance, was there no Christian strain in the humanitarianism of the much belaboured nineteenth century? Was there not a Shaftesbury and a Maurice? The Reports might have done more to show that there were a good many stars in a dark sky.

It was under *God's Design* that one hoped that the Reports would help us most. Of course much depends on what is meant by 'design'. If the word be taken to refer to God's *ultimate* purpose, many a New Testament text would define it. For instance, it is God's ultimate purpose that through His Son His name shall be hallowed, His kingdom come, and His will be done, 'in earth as in heaven'. No doubt even here there may be much discussion under the question, 'What exactly does this mean?', yet for practical purposes the meaning is sufficiently clear. If a man sees a 'city set on a hill', he may know that it is his business to reach it, even though he may not be able to plan its streets. But 'design' more properly describes, not the ultimate purpose, but the plan by which it is to be reached. It follows that the question 'What is God's Design?' means 'What would He have His Church to do, say, in the next hundred years?' Under *The Church and the International Disorder* a Commission has done a good deal to give the Christian answer. It may properly rejoice that, under however modified a form, the United Nations have accepted a charter of 'human rights'. There is no doubt that, if there had been no Church, there would have been no such charter. Here, again, however, the ground had long been prepared, and it cannot be said that the Commission has advanced much on earlier declarations on this urgent theme. On other subjects the harvest of the Reports is not plentiful. Here again the reason is partly that Christians are not agreed among themselves and partly that the Christian answer to the pertinent question has not been 'bolted to the bran'. Of course the *primary* answer even to the question 'What shall we *now* do?' is not doubtful. The Church's first business is to preach the Gospel, and to preach it to all men. It is remarkable that at earlier ecumenical gatherings little had been said of the missionary enterprise of the Church, the Missionary Societies being left to hold their own separate conferences. At this point Amsterdam registers real progress. But has the Church nothing to say to the 'world' except 'Repent and believe'? To frame the question more precisely, has it nothing to say to men *while they are refusing* to believe—as most of them seem likely to do for a long time? Has it no message to an unconverted world while it remains unconverted? There are some, notably Karl Barth, who reply 'Nothing'. One hears that he said this plainly at Amsterdam, and it might have been an advantage to those who don't specialize in theology if he had been given space to give a brief account of his reasons. But the vast majority of Christians believe, however vaguely, that the Church *has* a message to men even while they are refusing to be Christians. The difficulty here goes right back to the New Testament. As almost all scholars agree now, there is an Apocalyptic element in it that can no longer be ignored. The Apocalyptic idea is that at some future time God will Himself intervene in 'the world's affairs' and that then He Himself with speed will 'put things right'. It is a doctrine of Judgement and Salvation. If this is what He is going to do, does He leave anything for man to do in the meanwhile except choose or refuse to 'believe the Gospel'? The more obvious answer is 'Nothing'.

Being interpreted, this means that a Christian's one duty is to trust in Christ for his own salvation, and to call his fellows to a similar trust—but, while he has to earn his living in 'the world', he should, as far as may be, leave it alone and 'keep himself pure'. Those who repudiate any such doctrine, do it mainly in two ways, one pertinent here and one pertinent to the doctrine of the Church. Under the former the Christian makes a demand upon those who choose to remain 'in the world' that is summed up in what is technically called 'The Law of Nature'. Before considering this it may be suggested that the dilemma set by Apocalyptic may perhaps be mitigated if the Second Coming be compared with the first. It is more and more emphasized that the Incarnation is the decisive moment in history just because then God, as it were, broke into history. It was God's own sudden and decisive act. None the less, under His providence there was a long preparation for it, or there would be no Old Testament. The Prophets did nothing whatever to bring about the Incarnation, but they none the less prepared the way for it—some of them were even more or less clearly aware that they were doing so. Further, the Prophets appealed to the Law of Nature, though they called it the Word of the Lord. Fundamentally they preached that there are certain ethical principles that all men must acknowledge and under which they ought to live their lives. Of course all their hearers had some sort of a belief in God, and this is not so today. It is notorious that in the last century there were thinkers who accepted the Christian Ethic though they could not see their way to believe in the Christian God. John Morley is a leading example. Today the repudiation of God is no longer sporadic, but common. In Russia especially, or rather in the Bolshevik Party, this repudiation is universal. Further, it is now apparent, both in Russia and farther West, that to repudiate the Christian God is ultimately to repudiate also the Christian Ethic. A question, therefore, fronts the Church today that did not front the Prophets. Has the Church any message except 'Repent and believe' to men who declare that all ethics are 'relative' and therefore may be ignored whenever a man or nation so chooses? The answer seems to be that, whatever a man or nation may suppose, it is not possible to repudiate all ethics. An example may be taken from Marx himself. He was a determinist and therefore supposed that there can be no ethics. But, like all determinists, he was inconsistent when he passed from theory to practice. He spent his boyhood in Treves, and there is no wonder that there he came to believe both that religion is an 'opiate' and, even more passionately, that the common people were being wronged. It was this that inspired him to all his researches in the British Museum. He went wrong in his conclusions, to the woe of the world, but no one can believe that another is 'wronged' without an ethic. Marx 'said in his heart': 'These things *ought* not so to be, and I will do what I can to alter them.' He asserted, however subconsciously, that there is a universal and unalterable 'law of nature'. At the end of the Middle Ages the Church had integrated an account of this Law in terms that suited fairly adequately the period that was ending. With the Renaissance—using the term, not of a revolution in art merely, but of a revolution in man's whole way of life—this proved inadequate. For instance, it is said that when Vasco da Gama returned from his first voyage to the East, he 'realized' six thousand per cent. on his cargo! This meant, of course, that he had abused the ignorance and helplessness of the Asiatic workers—that is, he had flagrantly

abused the Law of Nature, for justice is one of its chief tenets. He abused the opportunities of capitalism (which, none the less, has its uses). There are now at last signs that the West is beginning to recognize that justice demands that the 'standard of living' of the Eastern masses ought to rise, however gradually, to that of the West. The Trade Unions talk of this, though sometimes rather because they do not want Western wages to be under-cut than because they yearn to do justice to the Eastern multitudes. They don't seem to perceive that to lift Eastern wages means that they themselves must be ready to pay more for such things as rice and tea and rubber. Yet this is what the Law of Nature requires. There are not a few signs in the Reports that the contributors are by no means unaware of these things, but there is no sustained restatement of the Law of Nature. Ought not this to have been attempted? Of course in the process differences of opinion would have clearly emerged. As it is, for instance, one writer claims that the rule of 'love' must be confined to the Church and that outside it only the writ of 'justice' runs, and many will contest this. But, where there are differences among Christians the Conferences on Faith and Order have shown the right way. The first need is combined hard thinking, and as its outcome, a clear statement of the ways in which Christians agree and of the points where they disagree. In one instance the Reports print two accounts of one subject. Mr. Foster Dulles and Prof. Hromadka both discuss 'Christian Responsibility in our Divided World', the one urging the claims of free democracy to be its right organ and the other putting the case for a communism other than the Russian. Might not this method have been used in other instances too? The Commissions seem to have been so intent on emphasizing Christian agreements that they have sometimes left the disagreements in the background. It would not be true to say that they are hidden, but, if we are to ask 'What are we now to do?', differences cannot be left to sporadic references, but must be submitted to systematic diagnosis. Can it be said that the Reports have carried much farther the discussion of the way in which the Church is now to call even those who refuse to be Christian to acknowledge and practise the ethics that they themselves, however unconsciously or subconsciously, hold? As in 'old time', the Law may prepare the way for the Gospel, but men must first believe that there is a law and know what it is.

In dealing with the *Church* the reports rightly depict both its 'shame' and its 'glory'. The way in which the Church, and the Church alone, showed itself indomitable in Hitlerite Germany and elsewhere, is a chief item in its 'glory'. Under its 'shame' all Christendom comes under judgement. Here we come upon the second way in which the Church may influence an unconverted world. Has not the world sometimes learned at least a partial practice of some Christian virtues from the Church? Even in India, for example, has the present Government's attitude to the outcastes no Christian roots? Or was it not the Church that led the way in the abolition of foot-binding in China? The example of Humanitarianism in the West has already been named. In brief, is not the Church sometimes like 'leaven'? May not something of its teaching permeate a sub-Christian or even a non-Christian world? But this leads to another problem. Is permeation consistent with separation? While persecution sorts out real Christians and the situation itself leads to separation, what about the lands of toleration? This leads on to an urgent question that the Reports

hardly mention. The first volume rightly begins with 'The Doctrine of the Church', and, again rightly, there is no attempt to gloss over the division within Christendom here. But the statement follows the lead of other recent Conferences and approaches this division under the doctrine of the Ministry. It may also be approached from the doctrine of Membership. Would not this have been more appropriate to the subject of the Reports? If the Church has any mission of permeation, ought there to be any clear distinction between its members and others? Probably all Christians would answer 'Yes', for all have the New Testament in their hands. What, then, is to be the mark of membership in the Church? Here no Church (not even the Baptist) has found the perfect way. Who is a 'member' of 'the body of Christ'?² In considering answers to this question a broad distinction may be traced which follows the same lines as when the approach is made, not from Membership, but from Ministry. Episcopal Churches, especially those that whole-heartedly believe in Baptismal Regeneration, tend to start from the declaration, 'Every baptized person is a Christian', and then to introduce qualifications. Even Rome has never very clearly committed herself to a definition of membership in Church, and in Catholic lands the phrase 'a *practising* Catholic' has emerged, but the idea persists that no baptized person, except the excommunicate and the people whom Rome calls 'apostates' or 'perverts', is altogether 'unleavened' by Christianity. As some current discussions show, the problem is troubling Anglicans in another way. On the other hand, the Free Churches have begun by declaring that only a confessed 'believer' who 'has the witness in himself', is a 'member' of Christ, and then have gone on to introduce modifications. Methodists, for instance, claim that it is enough if a man '*desires*' to live the Christian life. Under such qualifications it is easy, for instance, to slur the distinction between a 'member' of the Church and a member of a congregation. In other words, on both sides, though in distinctive ways, we see the difficulties of attempts to practice permeation. It very readily passes into the wrong kind of compromise, as the Reports show, and it is in such compromise that the shame of the Church roots. This raises the fundamental question, 'Is there a right kind of compromise, and, if there is, what is it?' Of course, this subject too is very difficult, but it would have been great gain if a beginning had been made with a clear and agreed statement of what the problem is and what the differences within the Churches are. This would have led to something more than a call to repent. There is little in the Reports that elucidates the way that the Church should follow after repentance.

So far we have been looking chiefly at doctrine, or, as some, who despise it, would say 'theory'. They are, of course, patently foolish to despise it, for its immense power, under the new term 'ideology', is today obvious in a distracted world. Yet no man would ever do anything if he waited until all the problems of theory had been solved. There are Christians in many parts of the world who, seeing the next duty amid Man's Disorder, are setting themselves to do that duty. Under the titles, 'Evidences of New Life in the Church Universal', 'The Gospel at Work in the World', and 'New Beginnings in the Relations of the Church with Society', three writers (including Mr. E. Clifford Urwin)

² It is interesting to note that an Anglican writer says that the Church is 'the body of Christ', while a Russian prefers to say that 'body' is the best of all *analogies* for the Church.

have collected a large number of instances of this from all parts of the earth. There is here an inspiring *Sursum Corda* for today. If any Christian is asking himself 'What am I now to do?' he might easily find the answer in these three inspiring chapters. A preacher too, seeking illustrations, will find a number ready to his hand here. One mark of these movements is their variety, and another the prominence of 'groups'. Christians know now that it is best to act together. No need to ask what distinguishes the members of these groups from the 'world'! They bear the obvious 'marks of Jesus'. They are, in their own ways, as indomitable as the Church in Germany. It might be well to read with these three chapters the shortest chapter in the volumes, 'Some Axioms of the Modern Man', for this shows the precise point where the Christian needs to attack today. He needs to challenge the current *presuppositions* of the secular mind. These are not what they used to be. Wesley, for example, could assume that the vast majority of his hearers believed that there is a God. Along with this—or rather, as the other side of this—he could assume that his hearers did believe in the seriousness of sin. Today a Christian cannot take it for granted that a 'man of the world' believes either in God or sin. This makes his enterprise hard indeed, for the doctrine of judgement goes with the doctrine of grace. But the 'groups' know that 'all things are possible to him that believeth'. And, of course, it goes without saying that there is no despair *anywhere* in these Reports. Sometimes it is a good thing for the Church to look into *its own* presuppositions. The chief of these, as the Reports insist, is that the Christ, who cannot fail, is committed to His Church. *Quis separabit?* There are multitudes of Christians who believe that Christ is at work in the World Council of Churches and that He showed this through the Holy Ghost at Amsterdam. The writer, who is not unaware that it is much easier to suggest than to achieve, is among them.

C. RYDER SMITH

THE CREATIVE ELEMENT IN THE THOUGHT OF JESUS¹

IS THERE a creative element in the thought of Jesus, and, if so, in what form does it gain expression? I prefer to put the question in this form rather than to speak of His originality, for in this word there is a tone of condescension, as if one classified Him with other great leaders of mankind. Having said this, I agree that it will not be possible to avoid the word without artificiality, but, at any rate, in speaking of 'the creative element', I have made my intention clear.

From many notable discussions of Primitive Christianity we gain the impression that His thought was not creative. He was not a philosopher and certainly not a scientific theologian, but a teacher and a prophet, and, of course, it is assumed, teachers borrow and prophets are declarative. It is the

¹ An Address given at the Commemoration Day service at Handsworth College, Birmingham, 5th November 1948.

ubiquitous community that is creative by reason of its endowment with that dubious entity 'the collective mind', and it is brilliantly creative, evolving *ex nihilo*, or from next to nothing, moving ideas and doctrines which have deeply affected the course of Christian thought and history. Or again, St. Paul, that shining example of Hellenistic thought, is the real founder of Christianity, who, nevertheless, turns out on examination to be much more Jewish, and indeed Rabbinical, than we had supposed, as Professor W. D. Davies has recently shown in his *St. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*. As a prophet, it is held, Jesus was receptive and absorbent. Almost everything He ever said can be found in the Mishnah or the Talmuds, mixed, it is true with much else of which the less said the better. The original element in His teaching is to be found in His speech forms, His sparkling epigrams, His poetic genius; but not in creative ideas which stand in an organic relationship to New Testament theology or to the later developments of Irenaeus, Origen, and Athanasius. Between Jesus and Paul yawns a gap.

Two initial considerations should lead us to pause before we give our assent to this view.

First, we must recognize that the greatest Old Testament prophets were creative in their thinking. Amos rose above the idea of a national god to the magnificent conception of Yahweh as the God of the whole earth, who brought the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir (9⁷). Jeremiah broke through conventional assumptions and discovered afresh the values of personal religion. Above all, that genius of the Exile, whose name we do not know, but of whom we speak as Deutero-Isaiah, bequeathed to the world the immortal portrait of a Suffering Servant, about whose identity scholars have speculated in a prolonged and unfinished discussion admirably described in Professor C. R. North's invaluable *Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah*. Prophets, it would appear, can be as creative as Bach and Shakespeare; they are not corybantic gossellers or conventional ethical preachers. On the contrary, they may sting a generation into new ways of thinking and inspire peoples yet unborn.

Secondly, we must face the inherent probability that a rich and persistent movement like Christianity began with a creative personality. This likelihood is at its strongest when the greatest of His followers speak of Him with veneration and awe. It is of no lay figure that St. Paul writes: 'Who, being the form of God, counted it not a thing to be clutched at, to be an equality with God', or that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews describes as 'the radiance of God's glory' and 'the express image of His essence'. Nor can St. John have been thinking of an ordinary person when sonorously he writes: 'And the Word became flesh, and tabernacled among us, and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth.' These writers impress us as men lifted out of themselves into a new world of thought and action. Doubtless, they used a new idiom and were themselves creative thinkers, with an originality which Christianity has always stimulated in converts, whether African lawyers, medieval monks, or Bedford tinkers; but they would be the first to reject the suggestion of being innovators, and to confess their insolvency apart from the initial impulse received in Christ. In their own estimation, they are the 'unprofitable servants' of an incomparable Master.

The question must naturally arise: How comes it that the creative character of the thought of Jesus has been so widely ignored and denied? Two suggestions may be offered in reply.

First, we have failed to assimilate the immense extensions of our knowledge of religious thought and practice in the centuries preceding and following the beginning of the Christian era. We have not seen facts in their true perspective. Consider, for example, our greatly increased knowledge of comparative religion. Max Müller's *Sacred Books of the East*, and innumerable monographs of special themes, have familiarized us with the complexity and wealth of religious ideas the world over. Against this background how small appears the work of an obscure prophet in the petty tetrarchy of Galilee! The idea of 'the dying god' finds worldwide illustration. What is distinctive in the story of the Cross? Again, with many gaps, we have greatly enlarged our knowledge of the Mystery-religions, and where knowledge has failed imagination has exercised her potent spell. The enthusiast has read with awe the mystic words: 'I have eaten out of the *tympanon*, I have drunk out of the *kymbalon*, I have become an initiate of Attis.' In imagination he has accepted the invitation of Chaeremon to dine at the table of the Lord Sarapis on the fifteenth at nine o'clock, and, in consequence, has found it easy to suppose that the Christian Eucharist owes more to the age than it owes to Jesus. Then, we have greatly extended our knowledge of mystical religion. The Hermetic writings and the sacred books of Mandaism tell of divine saviours who dwell among men and wing their way to the realms of light. Dazzled by discoveries, the investigator has passed lightly over the dates of relevant documents. W. Bauer re-wrote his commentary on the Fourth Gospel in order to insert impressive quotations from the Mandaeen writings, despite the fact that the earliest, the Book of John, is not earlier than the seventh century A.D. H. Delafosse maintained that the Gospel is the Christianized version of a Gnostic writing. Thus, in the first decades of this century the Fourth Gospel fell into the background as a source for the life and teaching of Jesus, and there it remains until we accept the astringent supplied by the opinion of F. C. Burkitt that it is useless to go to Mandaism as 'a key to unlock the mysteries of early Christian development', and learn from M. Goguel that the Gospel contains valuable material which the historian may not ignore. The Synoptics are shaken for us by Form Criticism. From Bultmann we learn to think of 'community-sayings' and from Bertram discover that the Passion Story is a collection of cult-narratives, and it is with surprise that we find this same Bultmann, helped by the anodyne of Barthian theology, writing a vigorous sketch of the thought of Jesus, and at some cost that we discover that the liturgical *motif* is often a conservative influence.

It goes without saying that, if used with critical discernment, many of these discussions provide us with an equipment which earlier students did not possess. Unfortunately, they are often taken at their face value. As examples of this I cite Loisy's *Birth of Christianity* and the Bishop of Birmingham's *Rise of Christianity*, in which opinions about theology and Christian documents are expressed with a confidence which makes the New Testament expert shudder. From such books it is easy to infer that, apart from its ethics, Christianity is out-moded, and that, while we still look to its Founder with wistful admiration, He is not a creative personality comparable with Charles Darwin or Karl Marx. Even

the high priest of Barthianism, Karl Barth himself, has described the Rabbi of Nazareth as 'one whose activity is so easily a little commonplace alongside more than one other founder of a religion and even alongside many later representatives of His own "religion" '.

The second suggestion I have to offer comes nearer home. The modern theological student is blessed by the aid of monumental encyclopedias, commentaries, and monographs. I mention in particular the invaluable works of Hastings, Cheyne and Black, Charles, Billerbeck, and Kittel. We are right to devote days and nights to the spoiling and appropriation of these treasures, but there is one peril against which we must be on our guard if we are in any true sense to appreciate the originality of Jesus. When we have painfully traced the background and antecedents of His teaching, it by no means follows that we are really acquainted with His mind and thought. All we have gained is material on which a judgement can be based, prolegomena, warnings against bypaths, the constructive gains of innumerable failures. We have still to ask how Jesus used older and contemporary ideas, how He combined them and made them a whole. Genius borrows, but it also transmutes; it leaves nothing as it finds it, but prints upon all an original stamp. It is precisely in this matter that much contemporary research is wanting. It is sometimes assumed that, if we know all there is to know about the history of the idea of the Son of Man, of the Messiah, and the Suffering Servant, we know what Jesus thought. In fact we know nothing of the kind. Schweitzers are always needed to tell us that Jesus is the great Unknown, a stranger to our generation and its ways of thinking, and yet is the most modern of all because in His hands are the keys of life and of death.

In what follows I shall try to show the justice of this claim, as I treat such themes as Messiahship, the Son of Man, the Suffering Servant, the Cross, the Resurrection, and the Parousia, and the creative use which Jesus made of these ideas.

1. I begin with the attitude of Jesus to Messiahship. This is no new question, although often it has prematurely been regarded as settled. Did not Jesus say expressly to the challenge of Caiaphas 'I am'?

The problem arises from the manifest reserve of Jesus and the injunctions to secrecy which He laid upon the healed and upon His disciples. 'Hold thy peace' He cried to the demoniac in the synagogue at Capernaum who declared that He had come to destroy them, and hailed Him as 'the Holy One of God'. 'See that thou say nothing to any man,' He said to the leper. 'Do not even enter the village,' He commanded the blind man near Bethsaida. Mark says that He suffered not the daemons to speak because they knew Him, and relates that both at Caesarea Philippi and at the descent from the mount of Transfiguration He charged His disciples to tell no man of Him. It may be that we have made too much of His reply to Caiaphas, for Matthew, supported by Luke, says that He replied 'Thou hast said', and important MSS. attest the same words in Mark. The reply was not negative; it probably meant 'Yes, but I shouldn't put it quite like that'.

For upwards of fifty years British scholarship has been preoccupied in refuting the thesis of Wrede that the charges to secrecy are a literary device on

the part of Mark to explain why Jesus was not confessed as the Messiah until after the Resurrection. And the answers are sound. It has pointed to the confession of Peter, the entry into Jerusalem, and the inscription on the Cross, and has argued that the first preachers would not have embarrassed themselves by proclaiming a crucified Messiah unless Jesus had been condemned as such. But a refutation is never a complete answer. It is necessary to account for the facts in a more credible way. And, in the main, we have paid Jesus the doubtful compliment of a policy of expediency: He did not want to provoke a popular uprising! This explanation is sound, but it is not the whole truth. I suggest that Messiahship as He understood it was not a title, nor primarily an office, but fundamentally a destiny. Messiahship was what He would do by dying and rising again. It was for this reason that He could not accept an honorific title which on the lips of others meant something entirely different. As one who healed the sick and cast out daemons He was the Messiah already, but a hidden Messiah, because His redemptive Messianic task remained to be fulfilled. He was *Messias absconditus* and *Messias futurus*.

Here I would point out how creative this thought was; it determined His conception of Himself and His estimate of His purpose. It is reflected in His sayings, but it lies deeper than any of them. So far from being compelled to part with His saying about the taking away of the Bridegroom, we must recognize that the rape of the Bridegroom is of the essence of His mission as He saw it and believed it to be.

2. I turn next to the vexed question of the Son of Man. On this question no generally agreed solution has been reached. We have ransacked the sources, we have studied the Psalms, Ezekiel, Daniel, the *Book of Enoch*, and Ezra 4, we have examined the concept of Primal Man; we have sifted the Rabbinical writings and have analysed Mark, Q, M, and L, but the problem still baffles us. In part our difficulties are due to the complexity of our sources, but still more, I think, to our slowness to admit that Jesus may have made an original use of the idea.

It is not easy to decide what use we are to make of the Book of Enoch. Dr. J. Y. Campbell thinks the Similitudes are 'quite inadequate to prove anything'. Our younger scholars are more optimistic. The Norwegian Nils Messel holds that the Son of Man in *Enoch* is a collective symbol, a view which reminds us of T. W. Manson's interpretation, while William Manson, J. Bowman, and M. Black are disposed to think that in some circles of pre-Christian Judaism the concept was interpreted Messianically. Few who have read T. W. Manson's *Teaching of Jesus* can be insensible to the fascination of the view that the Son of Man is the Elect Community, the Suffering and Saving Remnant, wholly devoted to God. Hitherto, many scholars have hesitated to accept his suggestion because in *Enoch* the Son of Man seems so clearly to be a superhuman personality and because it is difficult to give a collective interpretation to many of the sayings of Jesus. Manson, however, does not deny that 'Son of Man' is also a personal designation, and he provides for this interpretation by saying that, when the disciples fail to rise to the demands of the ideal, Jesus 'stands alone, embodying in his own person the perfect human response to the regal claims of God'. In his *Historic Ministry of Jesus* the late Dr. C. J. Cadoux made a very

effective use of this conception, and it is made easier of acceptance by the idea of 'corporate personality' expounded by Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson and Dr. A. R. Johnson.²

It may be that, if we are to make further progress, we may have to make a bolder use of conjecture. Nothing but good can result from the use of constructive imagination, provided we control it by fidelity to all the available facts and provided it is subjected to full and frank discussion. I suggest that in the Gospels the collective interpretation is overshadowed because, at the time when they were composed, the personal and eschatological aspects of the idea were dominant. It is possible that, influenced by Daniel 7, there was an earlier stage in which the collective use of the term 'Son of Man' was more prominent in the thought of Jesus. Now that we identify so closely the 'Kingdom of God' with the 'Rule of God', we require a conception which includes the idea of the domain in which the Rule is exercised, and the idea of the Elect Community supplies this want. Moreover, it is significant, I think, that to the end a communal aura surrounds the idea that the Son of Man 'must suffer', illustrated in the sayings about cross-bearing and drinking the cup and in the association of Peter, James, and John, with Jesus in Gethsemane. We also gain a more vivid and intelligent understanding of the Mission of the Twelve, when the disciples went forth two by two to announce the imminence of the Rule of God, if at that time Jesus expected its correlative, the setting-up of the Elect Community. Greatly daring, I suggest that we have not yet finished with the saying: 'Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of Man be come' (Matthew 10²³), and that, in our haste to allow for the fact that Matthew has applied the saying to the circumstances of the ninth decade, we may be destroying evidence. I can understand Matthew's procedure in adapting an embarrassing saying no longer relevant to the circumstances of his day, but not the invention of such an utterance to further the missionary expansion of the Church. If the saying is genuine, Schweitzer made a valuable contribution to the problem of Gospel Origins when he made the failure of the Mission of the Twelve a turning point in the Story of Jesus. If this suggestion is conjectural, it is certain that Jesus made a creative use of the Son of Man conception when He rebaptized it in terms of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53, and to this question I now turn.

3. In his *Jesus the Messiah* William Manson has suggested that in the *Similitudes of Enoch*, the Son of Man, the Messiah, and the Servant are identified; and, with varieties of emphasis, this identification is accepted by W. D. Davies and M. Black. The most impressive passage is *Enoch* 48⁴:

'He shall be a staff to the righteous whereon to stay themselves and not fall,
And he shall be the light of the Gentiles,
And the hope of those who are troubled of heart'.

Here, undoubtedly, it is pertinent to recall the Servant passages in Isaiah 42⁷, 50⁴ and 61¹⁴. But what we still miss in this proposed identification is the idea of the *Suffering Servant*, the doctrine that 'the Son of Man *must suffer*' and give his life 'a ransom for many'; and, so far as we know, this is an original element in the thought of Jesus, the clearest sign of His creative thinking. Even if it could be

² *The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God* (1942).

proved that He was preceded in this interpretation, His originality would remain; for it is no condition of genius that it must not borrow. Otherwise, the creativeness of Homer, Shakespeare, and Bach would have to be reconsidered. What genius does is to make new thoughts current coin; and, on this principle, there can be no manner of doubt to whose teaching the doctrine of a Suffering Messiah is due. The only known precursor is Deutero-Isaiah, and with the Ethiopian eunuch research still cries: 'I pray thee, of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of some other?' It was Jesus who first dared to believe that the ideal of the Servant was embodied in Himself, and combined it with the Messianic hopes of His countrymen. It was He who first taught that the Son of Man must suffer. How little the Christian community can be credited with this creative doctrine is seen in the fact that in the New Testament there is a progressive diminution of interest in this doctrine, to the subsequent impoverishment of post-Apostolic Christianity.

4. We come now to the question whether Jesus had a doctrine of the Cross. I believe that He had, provided we do not delimit too sharply the word 'doctrine'. Of course, we shall not want to represent Him as an Irenaeus or an Athanasius, still less an Anselm or an Aquinas. Ratiocinative thought is not to be looked for in the poet of the Beatitudes. But is it decently credible that a creative thinker, who perceived that the Son of Man 'must suffer', and believed that He Himself was that Son of Man, had no sort of idea why He must suffer, or what blessings His sufferings would confer upon men? Had He no answer, save that such was the Father's will? If, with Hastings Rashdall, we explain the 'ransom-saying' as meaning that 'His death, like His life, was a piece of service or self-sacrifice for His followers, such as they themselves might very well make for one another', we shall have to admit that His thought was commonplace rather than original. And if, further, we explain away His words about 'the blood of the covenant' and 'the cup' that He must drink, and if we transform the cry of desolation, 'My God, my God, how is it that thou hast forsaken me?', into a paean of pious confidence in God, we shall have to limit ourselves to the view that He died to reveal the love of God, a truth which, so far as we know, He never even mentioned. But if, on the contrary, we see Him steeped in the ideas of the Old Testament, and take seriously His words about 'blood', 'the covenant', and 'the cup', we shall have reason to believe that He thought in terms of sacrifice. To Him the sacrificial principle was as familiar as evolution is to ourselves, and it is reasonable to suppose that He used this idea creatively.

The Gospels show that He sat loose to ritual practices and had little use for the sacrificial system as such, although He did command the leper to make the prescribed offering and bade men offer their gifts after they had been reconciled one to another. But equally clearly His sayings show that He rejected the scribal interpretation of the Law, but, none the less reinterpreted it with amazing insight. Why should He not have done the same with the idea of sacrifice? In Judaism a sacrifice is a gift to God and a means of communion with Him: it can be degraded to the offering of a bribe; it can be elevated to the idea of a communal offering in which the worshipper shares. It is in this realm of ideas that we have most reason to think that the thought of Jesus moved. The

place of a material oblation is taken by the offering of Himself, and a crude substitution is obviated by the vital connexion between Himself and the Beloved Community and its faith relationship to Himself. It is true that later faith was interpreted more personally and more mystically by St. Paul and St. John, but in His teaching it is implicit in actions, the effective actions of eating and drinking. Thus, at the Last Supper, He interprets the Bread as His Body, and the Wine as His blood poured out for many, and commands that they are to be eaten and drunk as such; and in this way the faith relationship is more objectively conceived. All these ideas are fundamentally Jewish; there is no reason to seek the key for them in pagan feasts or mystery-conceptions.

We may go further. His words about drinking the cup show that He was conscious of feeling the weight of that wrath of God which rests upon human sin; not as a penalty transferred from the guilty to the guiltless, but as the destiny of a love which makes itself one with sinners and shares their plight. St. Paul did no more than transform this thought into an epigram when he spoke of Christ as 'made to be sin on our behalf, that we might become the righteousness of God in him' (2 Corinthians 5²¹). The cry of desolation reveals that redemptive suffering broke His heart.

In all this construction there is nothing extraneous or anachronistic. We are far indeed from the classroom of Origen or the cloisters of St. Thomas. Its advantages are that, without artifice or strain, we can keep close to His recorded sayings and His Jewish heritage of thought; we can do justice to His originality and thereby establish a genetic relationship between His thought and later Pauline and Johannine developments, not to speak of Christian theology in general.

5. I turn next to the place of the Resurrection in the thought of Jesus. If He spoke of death, He did not think of it as disaster. Faithful to Old Testament thought, He believed in the victory of divine purpose. Thus, whenever He says that the Son of Man will be rejected and killed, He adds 'and after three days rise again'. By this expression He meant, in accordance with the idiom of Hosea 6², the shortest interval of time. He believed that He would go before them into Galilee; that is, they would find Him there already. And find Him they did. Whatever may be said of the Empty Tomb, His disciples knew that He had appeared to them, and that He was 'known of them in the breaking of bread'.

6. Lastly, it is in the same context of thought that we may place the prophecy of His Parousia. For reasons which are intelligible His sayings on the future Coming of the Son of Man are obscured by the garish foliage of Christian hope. But the parting of the leaves does not reveal nothing. Much of His eschatology was 'realized eschatology', but not to the exclusion of a doctrine of the End Time, any more than, for St. Paul, Justification by faith, itself a piece of realized eschatology, precluded belief in the Last Judgement. Doubtless, with that foreshortening of history which is characteristic of prophetic speech, He left the impression that His return would be speedy. Doubtless also He has already come in His Spirit in the life of the Church and the crises of history. None the less it is in harmony with His teaching that He should still come in the consummation of history to reveal Himself to His own. And though we do not

know when or how, we still look for a New Age 'wherein dwelleth righteousness' and for the Parousia of Him who 'makes all things new'.

I conclude that, for the reasons that I have given, the thought of Jesus was creative, controlling, determining.

Christianity is an unfolding, not a recast; it is true to type, not cross bred. It has been able to receive and absorb into itself elements from other religions and philosophies, but always on the condition that they be born again and baptized into the name of Christ. And it has been able to do this because it begins with the dynamic creative personality of Him in whom God breaks into our world of space and time.

Professor E. F. Scott has aptly compared Christianity with a river and its tributaries, but the better similes are those used by Loisy at the time when he argued against himself in *L'Évangile et l'Église*. Christianity is like a reverberating echo which becomes more sonorous the farther it travels. It is like a tree the essence of which appears as truly in its branches and leaves as in the germ from which it springs; it is this because it is rooted in the Living Christ of God.

VINCENT TAYLOR

THE PROBLEM OF DEMON-POSSESSION¹

THE IDEA that the human personality can be possessed by demons is widely rejected today by the educated Westerner as an outworn superstition. Evidences and symptoms which to the Easterner of olden days pointed to demon-possession are either dismissed as unfactual, or explained in terms of nervous or hysterical illness. The modern man has no place for demons, and when he reads, in a passage in St. Mark's gospel to which I shall return, that a demon 'dasheth him down: and he foameth and grindeth his teeth, and pineth away',² the modern man murmurs 'epilepsy' with a superiority which, he assumes, leaves no questions unanswered.

After certain observations in the East, wide inquiry from scholars, and such study as I have been able myself to pursue during the last thirty years, I am at least certain of one thing: that the matter cannot be treated in this light-hearted way. The problem is not solved nearly so easily as that.

In the first place, our Lord clearly spoke about demons, cast them out—however we interpret that phrase—commanded His followers to cast them out, and appeared to believe that their power over men was the cause of certain illnesses.

I am aware, of course, of the way in which the modern man seeks to meet the difficulties. He alleges either:

(1) that Jesus was the child of His age in such matters; that His real humanity involved the sharing of the contemporary ignorance of the true cause of symptoms commonly described as proving demon-possession;

(2) that although He knew better, He made a concession to the ignorance of those around Him;

¹ This article was in print before the publication of Dr. Langton's book *Essentials of Demonology* (Epworth Press, 1955).

² Mark 9:18 (R.V.).

or (3) that like a wise mind-healer of today, He was unwilling to act or speak in a way which might make His patient suppose that He thought the patient's malady 'mere imagination'. The patient, then, as now, would lose that confidence and rapport which are so essential, unless the healer, for the time being at any rate, accepted the patient's own story of his troubles. If a healer of the mind, then or now, gave the patient the idea that in his—the healer's—opinion demons were the result merely of a disordered imagination, the patient would be driven farther into the dark recesses of his illness and be more difficult to heal. In the early stages of treatment, at least, the physician must accept the patient's interpretation of his symptoms.

Of these three points the last has a compelling cogency, but it ceases to have much relevance when we remember that in some instances, that of the 'epileptic' boy, for instance, in Mark 9¹⁴⁻²⁹, Jesus was not talking to the patient, but to his relatives and friends. There was less reason to assume the demonic origin of symptoms when talking to anyone other than the patient himself.

Let us examine now the other two points: that Jesus was Himself ignorant of the cause of certain diseases, or that He made a concession to the ignorance of His hearers.

Here two important things must be said.

The first is this most remarkable fact. If Jesus had been the child of His age in the matter of what we are pleased to call superstition, He would have shown the fact in other matters. In opposition to this He went out of His way to show His own *disbelief* in the popular demonology of His day, save in so far as *disease* caused by alleged demon-possession was concerned. As Dr. William Menzies Alexander, a doctor of medicine as well as a student of divinity, showed some years ago:³

He commanded His disciples to gather up the fragments; thus discouraging the idea that demons lurk in crumbs. He had no faith in the ceremonial washing of hands; so repelling the notion that spirits may rest on unwashed hands. He asked a draught of water from the woman of Samaria and thereafter entered the city; proving that He had no fear of drinking borrowed water and no belief in local *shédím*. He retired repeatedly to desert places and fasted in the wilderness; therein rejecting the popular conception that the waste is the special haunt of evil spirits. . . . The association of demons with animals is in conflict with Christ's assertion of God's special care over them.

In a word, apart from the context of disease and the possible exception of the storm on the lake,⁴ Jesus makes no reference to devils, *though the conversations around Him were full of references to them*. He makes an exception when He talks about certain types of illness. Then He does seem to accept the view of demon-possession. There is a significance in such a marked exception.

The second is that although the language used in Mark 8³² about the

³ 'Demonic Possession' in *The New Testament: Its relations, historical, medical, and theological*. William Menzies Alexander (T. & T. Clark 1902).

⁴ Mark 4³⁵. 'Be muzzled' is the same word used by Jesus in casting a 'devil' out of a man (cf. Mark 1²⁵). The use of the word may be accounted for by (a) the possibility that Jesus believed in a storm demon, (b) that Jesus made a concession to the disciples who thus believed, (c) that Peter thought Jesus was exorcizing the storm demon and used this word when telling Mark the story, (d) that Mark introduced it himself, or (e)—the interpretation I favour—that Jesus addressed the word to the men in the boat who spread panic and uselessness in a storm by giving expression to fear—though Peter may have mistakenly thought that the word was addressed to the storm demon.

deaf stammerer implies a demon, and that in Mark 9^{14b} expressly states that the patient was the victim of demon-possession, Jesus does not speak as though He attributed *all* disease to demon-possession. Luke 7²¹ differentiates disease from devil-possession. Matthew even differentiates between being possessed by a devil and being insane (4²⁴ and 17¹⁶). δαιμονιζεσθαι is to be possessed of a devil. σεληνιαζεσθαι is to be a lunatic.⁶ In the stories of Jairus's daughter, the woman with the haemorrhage (Mark 5²¹), the leper in Mark 1⁴⁰ and the paralytic in Mark 2, the man with the withered hand in Mark 3, the centurion's servant in Matthew 8⁵, the blind man in Mark 8²² and 10⁴⁶, there is no suggestion of demon-possession.⁷

These two points seem to me to indicate that whatever Jesus thought about disease, He did not share the beliefs of His day in regard to demons. *Only in the context of certain diseases, not all, does He mention them.*

Is it not possible that our Lord believed in demon-possession in certain cases and that He was right in so doing?

Turning to the case of the so-called epileptic boy in Mark 9^{14b}, it seems to me very arbitrary to declare that what is there called 'demon-possession' is epilepsy and nothing more. I consulted Dr. Matthew Black, of Leeds University, one of the greatest scholars on the Aramaic behind the Gospels, on the point, and he allows me to quote a sentence from his letter to me:⁸ 'I would be inclined to agree with you that something more than "epilepsy" was involved here, so far as the mind of Jesus is concerned.'

If anyone really understood what epilepsy was, the situation would be different, but no one appears to do so even now.

Jung claims that it is a form of hysteria, and, quoting Steffens, writes:⁹ 'We are forced to the conclusion that in essence hysteria and epilepsy are not fundamentally different, that the course of the disease is the same, but is manifest in a diverse form in different intensity and permanence.'

Savill counters this view strongly¹⁰ and indicates differences between epilepsy and hysteria. Charcot coined the phrase, 'hystero-epilepsy', but F. M. R. Walshe, one of the greatest authorities on the matter, says¹¹ that such a label 'has no place in clinical neurology and its use betrays uncertainty in the mind of the observer as to what he is looking at, together with a natural desire to be right whatever the nature of the attack'.

H. P. Newsholme, Medical Officer of Health for Birmingham, believes that epilepsy is psychogenic and quotes Rows and Bond¹² to the effect that it is caused by repressed fear.¹³

Beaumont defines epilepsy as 'a chronic disorder in which there are recurrent attacks of unconsciousness, with or without convulsions, due to no known cause'.¹⁴ Walshe defines it as 'the expression of a sudden and transient disturbance of cerebral function'.¹⁵ 'Epilepsy', he adds, 'has no morbid anatomy that has yet been discovered with the resources at our disposal'.¹⁶

⁶ See *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. I, p. 593.

⁷ My authority here is Professor J. Alexander Findlay, D.D., of Didsbury College, Bristol.

⁸ 20th December 1948. ⁹ *Analytical Psychology*.

¹⁰ *System of Clinical Medicine*, ed. Warner (Arnold, 12th Ed., 1946), p. 896.

¹¹ *Diseases of the Nervous System* (Livingstone, 3rd Ed., 1943), p. 122. (Italics mine.)

¹² *Epilepsy* (1926), p. 170.

¹³ *Health, Disease and Integration* (George Allen and Unwin 1929), p. 131.

¹⁴ *Medicine* (J. & A. Churchill 1945), p. 329. (Italics mine.)

¹⁵ *op. cit.*, p. 114.

¹⁶ *ibid.*, p. 115.

Post-mortem examinations do not reveal any satisfactory cause. The appearance of the brain is

in general either entirely negative or of such indefinite character as cerebral congestion. . . . In chronic cases of epilepsy such lesions as atrophy and degeneration of brain substance or vascular disease are frequently met with, but are, as is well known, common to many other forms of nervous disease and are much more probably the consequences rather than the cause of epileptic attacks. . . . Practically all that can be said about the direct cause is that . . . uncontrolled discharges of energy, devoid of any purposive action, take place from time to time in an unusual manner.¹⁶

It is known that hereditary disposition, intermarriage of relatives, intemperance, sudden fright, prolonged mental anxiety, overwork and alcoholism are predisposing conditions, but they are not causes and they are predisposing conditions of other diseases.

Unless, then, one has decided *a priori* that demons do not exist and that devil-possession is impossible, I would point out that in spite of all our Western and modern superiority of scientific nomenclature, we are no further on in our understanding of epilepsy by calling it 'epilepsy' since no one knows what epilepsy is, what causes it, what happens when an attack takes place, or what cures it. The guess that this mysterious brain-storm is due to some form of possession cannot, at our present level of knowledge, be dislodged by modern science.

The modern man says: 'But there are no such things as demons.' How does he know? As far as I know, educated members of all branches of the Christian Church believe in angels, whom the New Testament describes as 'ministering spirits, sent forth to do service for the sake of them that shall inherit salvation'.¹⁷ Why should there not be, in the universe, discarnate personalities, other than man, opposed to God and working harm in man? What about the 'world rulers of this darkness' and 'the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places'?¹⁸ Paul wrote of them and Westcott thinks that the emphasis on 'our wrestling is not against flesh and blood' implies a call to Christians to do battle with demons. The Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine says:¹⁹ 'To believe positively in the existence of spiritual beings other than human, is in no way irrational.' The only theory put forward as to how they came into existence seems to be that somehow in the creative process, freewill and evil-will have produced them. There is an old legend that intercourse took place between fallen angels and the daughters of men. We shrink from this ancient way of accounting for their existence, but I should like to put forward three pieces of evidence which seem to me to make belief in that existence credible. I will not claim more than that.

1. Evidence from the Mission Field

In India where I lived from 1916 to 1922 (save for two years on Active Service in Mesopotamia), I have talked with missionaries, who, in spite of a Western medical education, ascribed the symptoms of some patients to possession by some evil force—if not some evil intelligence, or, to use the phrase of one, a discarnate evil spirit. Miss Mildred Cable, whom I have met in England, is a

¹⁶ *Black's Medical Dictionary*, p. 325. (Italics mine.)

¹⁷ Hebrews 1¹⁴.

¹⁸ Ephesians 6¹².

¹⁹ p. 46.

quite impeccable witness, though, of course, like any other observer, her interpretation of her evidence may be faulty. In her book, *The Fulfilment of a Dream*,²⁰ she writes as follows:

Our first woman patient in Hwochow Opium Refuge became interested in the Gospel, and on her return home destroyed her idols, reserving, however, the beautifully carved idol shrines which she placed in her son's room. Her daughter-in-law who occupied this room . . . desired to become a Christian and gave us a warm welcome whenever we could go to the house. About six months later we were fetched by special messenger from a village where we were staying, to see this girl who was said to be demon-possessed. We found crowds of men and women gathered to see and to hear. The girl was chanting the weird minor chant of the possessed, the voice, as in every case I have seen, clearly distinguishing it from madness. This can perhaps best be described as a voice distinct from the personality of the one under possession. It seems as though the demon used the organs of speech of the victim for the conveyance of its own voice.²¹ She refused to wear clothes or to take food, and by her violence terrorized the community. Immediately upon our entering the room with the Chinese woman evangelist, she ceased her chanting, and slowly pointed the finger at us, remaining in this posture for some time. As we knelt upon the 'kang' to pray, she trembled and said: 'The room is full of *gwei*;²² as soon as one goes another comes.' We endeavoured to calm her, and to make her join us in repeating the sentence: 'Lord Jesus, save me.' After considerable effort she succeeded in pronouncing these words, and when she had done so we commanded the demon to leave her, whereupon her body trembled and she sneezed some fifty or sixty times, then suddenly came to herself, asked for her clothes and some food, and seemingly perfectly well, resumed her work. So persistently did she reiterate the statement that the demons were using the idol shrines for a refuge, that during the proceedings just mentioned, her parents willingly handed over to the Christians present these valuable carvings, and joined with them in their destruction. From this time onward she was perfectly well, a normal, healthy young woman.

In the same book, Miss Cable gives another interesting piece of evidence:

A spirit may take temporary possession of a human body in order to find a means of expression for some important communication, and after delivering its message leave the person unconscious of that which has taken place. An instance of this occurred in a family with which I am intimate. The eldest daughter was married into a home where she received ill treatment from her mother-in-law. For several years she was systematically underfed and overworked, and when at last she gave birth to a son, we all expected she would receive more consideration. The hatred of her mother-in-law was, however, in no degree abated, and when the child was a month old, she brought her daughter a meal of hot bread in which the girl detected an unusual flavour which made her suspicious. She threw the remainder to the dog, and, before many hours had passed, both the unfortunate girl and the dog were dead. Her father was away from home at the time, the young men of the family meanwhile carrying on the work of the farm. A few days later her brothers and first cousins, strong, vigorous,

²⁰ pp. 118f.

²¹ cf. the phenomenon of the 'direct voice' in modern spiritualism, where it is alleged the spirit uses ectoplasm from the medium to construct a larynx which can be used by the spirit.

²² "Gwei" (in the accounts from Nevius) is the term used by the common people to indicate the being whose influence is feared by all, and who receives from every family some measure of propitiatory sacrifice. We read in the *Uli chao chuan* or *Divine Panorama* that "every living being, no matter whether it be a man or an animal, a bird or a quadruped, a gnat or a midge, a worm or an insect, having legs or not, few or many, all are called *gwei* after death". Quoted from E. R. Micklem, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 70.

young farmers, being together in the fields, a male cousin, aged twenty-two, suddenly exhibited symptoms of distress. He trembled and wept violently. Those with him, becoming alarmed at so unusual a sight, went to his assistance, intending to take him home. He wept, however, the more violently, saying, 'I am Lotus-bud; I was cruelly done to death. Why is there no redress?' Others of the family were by this time at hand, and recognizing the effort made by the girl's spirit to communicate with her own people, whom she had had no opportunity of seeing in the hour of her death, spoke directly to her as though present. Telling her the facts of the case, they explained that all demands must remain in abeyance until her father's return, when the guilty party would be dealt with by her family whose feeling was in no sense one of indifference. In about an hour's time the attack passed, leaving the young man exhausted and unconscious of what had taken place.

Mr. E. R. Micklem,²³ commenting on this kind of evidence, says:

It is important not to ignore the fact that sober-minded observers find it hard to avoid the conclusion that the term demon-possession is an accurate description of the malady. Also, the peoples amongst whom the phenomena occur are in no sort of doubt that demon-possession differs from other diseases, and that demon-possession is demon-possession. Amongst them the thought in this respect is exactly parallel to that which we find in the New Testament. While there may be some haziness as to whether ordinary diseases are attributable to natural causes or demonic (and, indeed, some are definitely attributed to demonic), there is no question that these differ from 'demonic-possession' proper. Thus Nevius says, 'The Chinese of the present day [i.e. *circa* 1897] have separate and distinct names for idiocy, insanity, epilepsy, and hysteria, which they ascribe to physical derangement as their immediate cause, regarding them as quite distinct from demon-possession. They not infrequently ascribe diseases of various kinds to evil spirits, as their originating causes, considering them, however, as differing from the same diseases originating without the agency of spirits only in origin and not in nature, and as quite distinct from the abnormal conditions of "possession".'²⁴

2. Evidence from the phenomenon of multiple personality

The famous case of 'Sally Beauchamp' is relevant here. Dr. Morton Prince reported to the International Congress of Psychology in 1900 this case of multiple personality.²⁵ This case is so familiar that it can be referred to very briefly. Miss Beauchamp, called for convenience B₁, seemed at times to leave her body, which became controlled by B₂, or B₃ or 4, each a completely different personality and one which did things which B₁ hated and of which she disapproved. So one personality went out into the country and collected some snakes and spiders and put them in a box and posted them to B₁, the original Miss Beauchamp. When B₁ opened the box 'they ran out and about the room and nearly sent her into fits'.

No seance was necessary to induce one of the other personalities to take charge of Miss Beauchamp. Nor when one did so was there any doubt that Miss Beauchamp's body and mind were controlled by an entity completely

²³ To whom I am here indebted. See his *Miracles and the New Psychology* (Oxford University Press, 1922).

²⁴ Waldmeier in his *Autobiography* speaks of his ten years in Abyssinia and gives a striking account of so-called 'possession'; quoted in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. I, p. 594.

²⁵ See *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, Vol. XV, pp. 466ff. This case is summarized and commented on in F. W. H. Myers, *Human Personality*, Vol. I, pp. 341ff., and by McDougall in *Proceedings of S.P.R.*, Vol. XIX.

different from the controls of, perhaps, only a few moments earlier. The patient's character was completely different according to the control, and her health varied also. One control gave her average health, another poor health, a third exuberant vitality and radiant health. Dr. Morton Prince investigated the knowledge which one personality had of the others. For example, he claims to have established that B₁ knew nothing of B₂ or B₃, but that B₃ 'knew all about the acts of B₁ and B₂, but the thoughts of B₁ only'. It is important to remember that though I have used the word 'possession', Dr. Prince concluded that all the phenomena could be explained on the hypothesis that parts of Miss Beauchamp's personality were dissociated or split off, and had an existence of their own, but like the fingers of the hand, were, while separated, joined at the wrist and received their vitality from that unity.²⁶

On the other hand, William McDougall writes:²⁷

In the one type (of which Sally Beauchamp remains the best example) the co-conscious activities become so highly developed and organized that we cannot refuse to recognize them as the activities of an independent synthetic centre, a numerically distinct psychic being, which, owing to insufficient energy of control of the normally dominant centre, escapes from its position of subordination and repression, and, not without a prolonged struggle, actualizes and develops in an abnormal degree its latent capacities.

He adds:

The feature of the Beauchamp case which most strongly supports this view is, perhaps, the occurrence of sustained and seemingly very real conflicts of will between Sally and the alternating phases of Miss Beauchamp's personality; these, if we accept the description given (and it is perhaps permissible to say here that the good faith and scientific competence of the reporter of the case are indisputable), were no mere conflicts of opposed impulses, such as any one of us might experience, but conflicts of the volitions of two organized and very different personalities. Another fact brought out clearly in the description of this case, one very difficult to reconcile with the view that Sally was merely a fragment of the normal personality, is that Sally's memory was more comprehensive than that of the normal personality, since it included all or most of the latter's experiences as well as her own. . . . Sally seemed to become directly aware of these thoughts and emotions (of Miss Beauchamp) and yet to know them as Miss Beauchamp's and to regard them in a very objective manner.

It is clear that Myers came to the conclusion that 'the fact of possession has now been firmly established', though, of course, this is not evidence of 'demon-possession'. Yet if disincarnate evil intelligences exist and if 'the fact of possession has now been firmly established', it would seem to be against the evidence to assert that demon-possession is incredible.

3. Evidence from Spiritualism

Some will turn this page with impatience supposing that I am trying to prove one absurdity by the use of another. I am not here, however, claiming that Spiritualism is correct in the deductions it draws from the phenomena. I will, however, state that my own studies and experience compel me to say

²⁶ *The Dissociation of a Personality*, Morton Prince (Longmans).

²⁷ *Body and Mind* (Methuen, 4th Ed. 1918), pp. 368-9.

that Spiritualistic research has uncovered a whole mass of phenomena which remains when all possibilities of fraud have been excluded.

I have attended three seances, with three different mediums, all of them reliable and incapable of conscious fraud. In the first, in a slum house in Leeds where I witnessed a seance with a doctor friend, an uneducated coal-miner in a trance spoke for nearly an hour in the perfect diction of a deceased Oxford scholar who 'controlled' him, using words quite certainly beyond his normal vocabulary and maintaining throughout an 'Oxford accent' completely beyond his normal powers of imitation. In the second, a most dignified and saintly lady spoke with a foreign accent and expressed views quite outside the normal scope of her interests. In the third, the medium was controlled in turn by a London newsboy, an Anglican clergyman, a middle-class lady, and a street-corner flower seller in a way which did not admit of any possible fraud.

I am not here putting forward any plea for the acceptance of the Spiritualist hypothesis. I am introducing into my argument at this point evidence that apparently human beings can, under certain circumstances, be controlled by what appear to be other intelligences. It seems as credible to me to believe in 'other intelligences' as to believe that the mediums were controlled only by their own unconscious. If the latter, why the completely different voices?

My own conclusions, then, about demon-possession are as follows:

1. That from earliest times until modern times, much disease has been **WRONGLY** attributed to demon-possession. Modern psychology is becoming increasingly aware of the result, in terms of disease, of such emotions as pride, hate, fear, resentment, malice, jealousy, and worry, especially when these emotions are harboured in the deep mind over a long period. These are 'demons' indeed, and it may be that when we know more, all cases, ancient and modern, attributed to 'demon-possession', will be found to be within the area of psycho-somatic disease.

2. That it is highly doubtful whether *all* cases attributed in the Bible and on the mission field to demon-possession can be completely explained in terms of psychiatric nomenclature. The experiences on the mission field may seem strange to our Western thought, but to me they seem close to the experiences related in the Bible. There, human nature is not an impenetrable entity. The individual is not isolated from the race, nor the entity called 'humanity' isolated from the universe. Human nature is not essentially evil, but it has 'fallen' in that it has been invaded by, and has yielded to, evil powers, which are not mere absences of good, but 'wills' which are hostile to God's will and which are the spawn of the Devil, who has seized control of man's will and turned him against God. Even 'sin' and 'death' are, in the Bible, objective forces hostile to God. Nowhere are we encouraged in the Bible to link individual suffering with individual sin. There is such a thing as the sin of the world, a 'set-up' into which we are all born and which affects us all in terms of sin and of suffering. This itself is the result of evil wills. Why should their invasion of men's spirits seem incredible?

It is significant that the Anglican Church still maintains its exorcists. In the time of Origen (b. A.D. 185) the exorcist ranked third in the grade of orders of clergy. His method sounds strange today. Making the sign of the cross on

the patient's head, he made the latter kneel, if able to do so, and sprinkled his brow with holy water. Then the exorcist asked the devil his name and adjured him, by the holy mysteries of the Christian religion, not to afflict the patient any further. Laying his hands on the patient's head, he said: 'I exorcise thee, unclean spirit, in the name of Jesus Christ; tremble, O Satan, thou enemy of the faith, thou foe of mankind who hast brought death into the world, who hast deprived men of life and hast rebelled against justice, thou seducer of mankind, thou root of all evil, thou source of avarice, discord, and envy!'

'The act of Christian exorcism is two-fold—it does not end with the "rebuke" and expulsion of the demon, but is completed by the invocation of the Holy Spirit to enter the temple of God vacated by the evil spirit.'²²

3. That belief in the possibility of demon-possession is not incompatible with the tenets of the Christian religion or contradicted by any reputable scientific research.

It is interesting here to recall that John Wesley²³ often ascribed phenomena which accompanied his preaching to demon-possession. Professor Findlay²⁴ makes two interesting observations. The first is that Wesley mentions demon-possession much more in the early days of his field preaching than in later years. Demon-possession is also mentioned much more in the early pages of St. Mark than in the records of Christ's later ministry. It is not mentioned at all in the fourth Gospel. Does the excitement of the early stages of a religious revival bring into activity these symptoms? Is it because the 'demon' (? unconscious) fights against new-birth?

The second is that demon-possession seems localized; more common in some places than others. The fourth Gospel deals largely with the Judean ministry, and demon-possession seems unknown. The synoptists give instances which are all confined to the north of Palestine. There is one case at Tyre which was outside Palestine altogether (Mark 7²⁴ and Matthew 15²¹). In the Acts we hear of it in Samaria (8⁷) and at Ephesus (19¹²).

4. Finally, I desire to make a comparison with poltergeist phenomena. If I hear strange noises in a room, I seek to understand their cause and the last hypothesis to which I am driven is that they proceed from poltergeists.

Yet, having examined the evidence and listened to the most convincing accounts of two of my friends, both witnesses of the phenomena, one an English judge and the other a Scottish solicitor, I cannot deny the phenomena.

Similarly, the last hypothesis to which I am driven in accounting for illness of mind and body is the hypothesis of demon-possession. Yet, in view of what is written above, I cannot rule it out as incredible, especially in regard to the far-off days of the Biblical narrative and the far-off places of the world where the power of Christ has yet had little chance of overcoming His enemies.

LESLIE D. WEATHERHEAD

²² *Christian Healing*, Evelyn Frost (Mowbrays 1940), p. 150.

²³ *Wesley's Journal* for 25th October 1739 and subsequent days.

²⁴ In the *British Weekly*, 23rd December 1948.

THE TWO ISAACS

Newton 1642-1727: Watts 1674-1748

NOT LONG ago, in a Congregational church vestry, I had the pleasure of seeing and sitting in Isaac Watts's study chair. It was of self-respecting Queen Anne craftsmanship, elegant, perfectly preserved, and of course, diminutive in size, for Isaac Watts was a tiny man, shorter and slighter even than John Wesley. That modest chair, dignified and unshowy, seemed characteristic of its owner. Humble-minded in the Christian sense of the word, he would have been shocked at the title and theme of this article. To be thus linked with the god-like Newton would have appeared to him preposterous. To that age Isaac Newton was the greatest genius that ever lived. For a century and more he bestrode the European scene like a Colossus. It is obvious that Newton immeasurably eclipsed the other Isaac, but this article will attempt to put in clearer light their undoubted spiritual and intellectual affinity, and to show how Watts through his hymns brought the note of Newtonian sublimity into English religion.

In the earlier centuries of the Renaissance the efflorescence of the arts and humanities quite overshadowed the natural sciences, but in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries 'Science' made up for lost time and became (as it has remained) the dominating element in modern culture. The sensational success of Copernicus (1543), Galileo (1620), Descartes and Kepler (1630), ushered in a new age and changed the whole picture of the world as it had been viewed by all previous generations. These 'infatuated star-gazers' revolutionized the status of the earth. From being the complacent hub of the universe it dwindled into a lowly member of a mediocre solar system. After having stood fast on its foundations for five thousand years, furnishing the standard metaphors of stability and permanence, it suddenly started twirling giddily on its own axis and spinning round the sun like a moth round a candle. The shock was terrible. No wonder the Church strove to soft-pedal and 'stagger' the effect of such innovations. It looked as though the lord of creation had lost his birth-right; the only dignity left to him being the power to penetrate the secrets of nature and to discern his own insignificance. Not even Darwinism administered such a blow to man's pride, nor struck down so dramatically all his dearest prejudices. It was, in all senses, a bolt from the blue. It is more than four centuries since Copernicus published his *De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium*. Not all men saw the vast import of the scientific revolution even then; many do not appreciate it even now.

Once the ball had started rolling it gathered velocity at an astonishing rate. Each discovery was a seed that produced a harvest.

Galileo died in 1642; in that same year Isaac Newton was born. It is the glory of Newton to have crowned the labours of Copernicus, Galileo, and Kepler by his discovery and demonstration of the law of gravitation, the principle by which all bodies, terrestrial and celestial, are governed.

The fame of Isaac Newton is as supreme in the realm of science as that of Shakespeare in poetry or Napoleon in war. His *Principia* was published in 1687, although Newton made his chief discoveries as early as 1665-6 when he was but twenty-three years of age. For twenty years he tested and perfected his calculations, being unwilling to put forth anything doubtful or incomplete. In 1727 he was buried in Westminster Abbey—'like a King who had done great good to his subjects', said Voltaire.

The *Principia* sent a major thrill through all the academies of Europe and, like Darwinism, profoundly influenced not science only but every realm of knowledge. It directed and coloured the whole intellectual outlook of the age in religion, philosophy, social and economic science, and the arts. Judged historically the *Principia* must still pass as the most momentous work of science ever produced. No other ever enjoyed such a vogue as Newton. John Locke bade the human race congratulate itself on the possession of so great an ornament. James Thomson wrote

*Let Newton, pure intelligence, whom God
To mortals lent to trace His boundless works
From laws sublimely simple, speak Thy name
In all philosophy.*

In England the humorist is ever with us, and in the eighteenth century one of them flippantly suggested

*That Newton was the first man that could grapple
Since Adam, with a fall, or with an apple.*

Pope, whose *Essay on Man* is full of Newtonian echoes, voiced the common admiration in an epigram intended for the scientist's epitaph:

*Nature and Nature's laws lay hid in night;
God said, Let Newton be! and all was light.*

Eighteen editions of the *Principia* (a terribly difficult book) were sold before 1789. In that same period innumerable simplified versions were published in every European language.

Newtonian hero-worship on the Continent exceeded, if anything, the patriotic pride of Englishmen. Fontenelle and Voltaire declared that no man could come nearer to the gods, and that Newton was greater than Caesar, Alexander, Tamerlane, or Cromwell! Newton thus put science not only on the map but in its very centre.

The Newtonian world-machine that dominated science until the biological discoveries of the nineteenth century was, as Thomson said, 'sublimely simple' in its main outline. The universe was a vast mechanical order. Its fundamental constitution was the laws of motion. Created complete at some moment of time by the Divine artificer, it followed without change or failure the unrolling of its cyclical processes.

The god of the Middle Ages had been a magician; the Newtonian god was a mechanic.

It is important to remember that Newton was as far as possible from Spinozistic pantheism. In the *Principia* he says: 'This Being governs all things, not as the

soul of the world, but as Lord over all'; and in a letter to Bentley (1692): 'The motions which the planets now have could not spring from any natural cause alone but were impressed by an intelligent agent.' It is needless to quote further. But one must repeat that Newton combined with his strictly scientific reasoning a deep and reverent piety, seeing in the marvellous nicety of order and arrangement in the universe the surest proof of an intelligent and benevolent Creator.

The immense reputation of Newton's science sent his gospel of theism reverberating round the world; the law of gravitation was long held by Christians to be the irrefragable proof of God's existence. If David's heavens declared the glory of God, how much more Isaac Newton's.

In Bentley's Boyle Lectures on *The Folly of Atheism* (1693) the author refers repeatedly to 'that very excellent and divine Theorist, Mr. Isaac Newton, to whose most admirable sagacity and industry we shall frequently be obliged in these discourses'. Locke follows suit: 'The phenomenon of gravity is impossible to be explained by any natural operation of matter or any other law of nature, but the positive will of a superior Being so ordains it.' Addison, Haller, and countless others join in saluting Newton as the invincible champion of theism.

True and significant is it that a minority of Christians were afraid of the subversive influence of the new science. The pietist Francke confessed that he could not make students of geometry into good Christians. His colleague Lange (some of whose noble hymns John Wesley translated) called mathematics 'a false erudition leading to atheism'. It is interesting to find that John Wesley stopped the study of mathematics because he feared it would make him an atheist; he also pinned his faith to a Reverend Mr. Jones of Nayland who (according to Wesley) 'seems to have totally overthrown the Newtonian principles'!

All this brings us to the other Isaac.

Isaac Watts was born in 1674, the year Milton died. He was a notable product of the Dissenting Academies to which unbending Nonconformists, excluded by theological tests from Oxford and Cambridge, were obliged to turn. Educational establishments which produced Bishop Butler, Archbishop Secker, Defoe, and many another illustrious name, have no need to apologize for their record. Watts left the Academy at Stoke Newington with perhaps a less fastidious mastery of Greek and Latin, but with a body of knowledge and a range of interests far greater, than he would have acquired at the Oxford of his day. One cannot turn the pages of his *Works*, in six folio volumes, without respect for his encyclopedic attainments. In particular he had imbibed an enthusiasm for astronomy and mathematics. It would be wrong to think of Watts as a master-thinker. It was not in him to give a new direction to world thought as did Hobbes, Hume, and Berkeley. His mind was rather receptive and critical. He shows a remarkable awareness of the main intellectual currents of his time. As an evidence of his wide sympathies, it is worth recording that his name appears among the early benefactors of Harvard College. While a student he shared in the general excitement over Newton's epoch-making discoveries. If necessary, one could fill pages from his *Works* where he follows (to use his own words) 'the great Sir Isaac Newton, the first of philosophers, the glory of Great Britain, and renowned among the nations'. Referring to his

youthful scientific opinions he says: 'I have seen reason to resign them long ago at the foot of Sir Isaac Newton, whose illustrious name stands highest in this sphere and without a rival.' We know, too, that one of Watts's old fellow-students and life-long friends, John Eames, F.R.S. (whom Watts called the most learned man he had ever known), was a close associate and regular correspondent of Newton. An eloquent Latin epitaph, the joint composition of Eames and Watts, expresses in lapidary form the veneration in which they held the great scientist's name. Indeed, in that century there was no escape from Newton. The country was filled with clocks, watches, sun-dials, and time-measuring devices of every sort. In one of the rooms of the house where Watts lived for thirty-years was a spot-dial (an invention of Newton) which consisted of a mirror fixed in the floor so as to reflect the sun on to a dial marked on the ceiling. Watts composed upon it the lines:

*Little sun upon the ceiling
Ever moving, ever stealing
Moments, minutes, hours, away,
May no shade forbid Thy shining
Whilst the heavenly sun declining
Calls us to improve the day.*

Hear his summing up: 'If there be a world, there is a God; if there be a sun and stars, every ray points to their Creator; not a beam of light from all the lucid globes but acknowledges its mission from the wisdom and will of God, and feels the restraint of His laws that it be not an eternal wanderer.' 'Without acquaintance with these mathematical sciences, I could not raise my ideas of the Creator to so high a pitch. From the study of Astronomy we learn the immense Power of God, the magnificence of His creation, and His own transcendent grandeur. Those astonishing spaces in which the planets revolve, the hugeness of their bulk, and the almost incredible swiftness of their motions—all governed and adjusted by such unerring rules that they never mistake their way, nor lose a minute of their time, nor change their appointed circuits: when we muse on these things we may lose ourselves in holy wonder and cry out with the Psalmist: "What is man that Thou art mindful of him?"'

Like everything else, Newtonianism had its bad as well as its good side. So far-reaching a doctrine not only stimulated 'classicism' in poetry, architecture, and kindred arts, but confirmed Deistic tendencies in theology by its emphasis on the transcendence of God at the expense of His immanence. When men considered the stars and planets, beholding

*rank upon rank
The armies of unalterable law,*

they were in danger of remembering the law and forgetting the law-giver. In spite of Newton's repeated statement that the bodies forming the solar system required God for the imposition of the principles on which all depended, it is not difficult to see that his world-view would be likely to lead to an extreme monotheistic doctrine of God as essentially transcendent and only accidentally immanent. (The nineteenth century witnessed a precisely opposite tendency.)

In the history of ideas the besetting danger is over-emphasis or over-simplification.

The Western doctrine of grace, derived from St. Augustine, leaned heavily toward the notion of a transcendent God promulgating His law, imposing His will and distributing His partial favours on the world. Such a doctrine tended to degenerate into a concept of a Divine Despot and a slavish universe.

Calvin might well have regarded Newton, with his inflexible laws, as a useful ally. The Methodist historian, Dr. Umphrey Lee, has noted this kinship between the irresistible grace of Calvinism and the irresistible mechanism of nature: 'It was along this very line that Wesley made one of his main attacks upon Calvinism. In two tracts, *Thoughts on Necessity* (1774) and *A Thought on Necessity* (1780) Wesley traces the connexion between the mechanical philosophy of the world and Calvinism. To Wesley the picture of man helpless to co-operate with God (Calvinism) was essentially the picture of man helpless before the Newtonian world-machine.' In a mechanical universe, not only was man overwhelmed; God himself was lost. In Professor Whitehead's words: 'In the eighteenth century God made His appearance in religion under the frigid title of the First Cause, and was appropriately worshipped in white-washed churches.'

It is certain that Newton's influence was one of the most potent factors in ushering in the 'Age of Reason'. Since Nature had been found to be orderly and rational in structure, it seemed to follow that whatever was reasonable must *ipso facto* be natural. Men sought 'a natural order' in all things, a natural morality, natural rights, natural laws of society and of wealth.

Locke tried to apply Newton's method in the elucidation of social laws and undertook a scientific analysis of human nature and society on the model of mechanics. Poets, painters, and architects, imposed rigid order on their realms. Critics like Pope and Boileau were great on 'the unities', and formulated the rules and conventions of a neo-classic ideal. Men were moved to build in 'the geometric spirit'; Versailles set the style all over Europe.

Analysis and calculation made the artist and poet as they made the mathematician. Mysticism became heterodox and 'enthusiasm' the unforgivable sin. The stained glass of Chartres was carted off to the rubbish heap to let more light into the choir. Fanny Burney's Evelina desired to pull down the dark and gloomy 'gothic' monstrosity of York Minster and build another in the style of Palladio. It was inevitable that religion should be submitted to the same tests. It, too, must be natural or 'rational'. In practice this meant a drastic dilution of historic Christianity. Bishops like Tillotson, Hoadly, and Warburton, would have been made profoundly uncomfortable by 'the impractical ethics' of the Sermon on the Mount, by the fierce ardours of medieval asceticism, or the socialized love of the thirteenth century. Even the more idealistic and challenging elements in Puritanism disappeared in the light of 'reason'. The attempt was made to strip the religious life of all that was 'irrational', and not obviously of social utility, judged by the standards of decent prudential morality. Christianity was looked upon, in the cool scientific spirit, as offering transcendental sanctions for utilitarian virtues. It was not very easy to worship Newton's law-giver—and still harder to love him.

In men's experience of the Divine, the immediate vision of God's personal

reality, the tragic hunger for redemption, the urge to utter self-sacrifice and devotion, were dismissed as superstition or 'enthusiasm'. The living Christ, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, conviction of sin, the rapture of forgiveness, the quest for holiness, disappeared as mere 'revelation'. God was no longer 'Our Father', the object of aspiration and love; He became primarily the Creator, the First Cause of the machine universe. Miracles were discarded not only as incredible but as unworthy of the Creator.

Orthodox defenders of the faith, as well as Deistic foes, helped to shear Samson of his locks. Lecky, an unimpeachable witness, has summed up: 'The effect was to lower enthusiasm and to diminish superstition. Men became half-believers. Strong religious passions of all kinds died away. There was a tendency to dwell exclusively upon the moral aspects of the faith. Earnestness was branded as fanaticism.' No wonder toleration flourished! The sort of toleration, begotten of indifference or doubt, that says we will respect each other's opinions now that we have begun to doubt our own! As a matter of fact, irreligion was tolerated, as being more respectable, rather than religion. It became a mark of civilization to regard religion as a somewhat discreditable naïveté. In 1738 Montesquieu, who resided here, declared that there was no religious life in England. Without any sense of impiety Voltaire himself built a chapel and occasionally worshipped in it, with the inscription *Deo erexit Voltaire*. Even Calvinism shared in the general déroute. Where it did not lead outright to Deism, it fostered Arianism and Socinianism, from which the step to Deism is not great. The Affinity between Calvinism and Deism is obvious. If all is ruled by immutable decree there is neither need nor logic in prayer or worship. These things are but the idle beating of the wings against the prison bars.

Thus it came about that Newton's awe-struck theism was de-personalized, and engendered an all-pervasive bias against the supernatural.

The Methodist reaction against Deism has been described by H. B. Workman in a classic paragraph. 'Wesley destroyed Deism, not by his pen but by his deeds. The Deist had appealed to logic; Wesley leaving the more logical issues to Butler and Berkeley, appealed to the heart. In place of a frozen theology he gave us a living experience in which God was not hidden, neither far off, but very nigh. God, said the Deist, is unrelated. Wesley taught once more the great Pauline truth—relation in Christ Jesus, the redeemed soul conscious of its sonship to the Father through the Holy Spirit. Prayer said the Deist, is illogical and absurd; God is not a man that He should change. Wesley's answer was to teach men how to pray, and so to pray that whether God was changed or not, their relations to God were for ever changed. There is nothing mysterious, the Deist claimed, in Christianity; Wesley brought men face to face with the mystery of the Cross. Miracles the Deist added, are impossible, a manifest contradiction. Wesley appealed to experience itself and adduced the supreme miracle of life, the break in all continuity exemplified in every conversion of a sinner into a saint.'

Nevertheless, the scale of the Methodist duel with Deism must not cause us to ignore other prophetic souls and servants of God.

When we remember the intrinsic excellence of Watts's hymns, his national reputation (a monument was erected to his memory in Westminster Abbey),

his unchallengeable distinction as the pioneer of English hymn-writers who blazed the trail for Charles Wesley and later writers to follow, we shall not be likely to belittle the contribution of Isaac Watts toward a revival of authentic Christianity.

Watts put his best into his hymns. They are no poetic 'exercises', but the inspired outpourings of a soul 'lost in wonder, love, and praise' before the glories of the Faith. He maintained, as against Boileau, that 'the naked themes of Christianity have something brighter and bolder in them, something more surprising and celestial than all the adventures of gods and heroes, and all the dazzling images of false lustre that form and garnish a heathen song'. Here is the testimony of no shame-faced apologist.

When we consider the mind of Isaac Watts, it is at once evident that he had something more than an intellectual appreciation of Newton's cosmic range and splendour. There was a profound spiritual affinity between them. In Watts's hymns, sermons, and essays, there is frequent reference to Christ as the Sun radiating his magnetic life-giving beams upon the planets; e.g. 'As in the new philosophy of Sir Isaac Newton, the distances are prodigious to which the powerful influence of the sun reaches in the centre of our planetary system, why may not the nature of our Lord Jesus Christ have a dominion given Him by the Father larger than the sun in the firmament?' That the Newtonian universe was a congenial home for Watts's imagination is apparent from several of his most characteristic hymns:

*Eternal Power! whose high abode
Becomes the grandeur of a God:
Infinite lengths beyond the bounds
Where stars revolve their little rounds.¹*

Or again,

*Thy voice produced the sea and spheres,
Bade the waves roar, the planets shine;
But nothing like Thyself appears
Through all these spacious works of Thine.*

*A glance of Thine runs through the globe,
Rules the bright worlds, and moves their frame;²*

*But O the glories of Thy mind
Leave all our soaring thoughts behind.³*

Here is another hymn in which his inmost spirit expresses itself:

*The Lord Jehovah reigns;
His throne is built on high,
The garments He assumes
Are light and majesty:
His glories shine with beams so bright,
No mortal eye can bear the sight.⁴*

¹ M.H.B., No. 6.

² *ibid.*, No. 41.

³ *ibid.*, No. 6.

⁴ *ibid.*, No. 58.

Watts was a Calvinist, but a gentle-hearted one, and recoiled from the terrible decree of reprobation. (Even Dr. Johnson was moved to tenderness by 'his meekness of opposition and mildness of censure'.) He trembled before the thought of Hell, yet expresses within himself 'a latent hope that God has some secret mitigating decree; and that, although we neither dare preach nor speculate upon it, bowing to the word, we may yet hope that Infinite love will find out a way'.

Watts had a deep sense of the Divine Sovereignty; his native dignity and love of the sublime give to his conception of God a grandeur that neither Calvin nor Newton would disown. But he does not stop there. After enumerating the glorious attributes of the Creator, he continues:

*And will this sovereign King
Of glory condescend?
And will He write His name
My Father and my Friend?*⁵

We can be sure that after Watts has sounded 'His power abroad' he will go on to 'sing the sweet promise of His grace'. And, indeed, who could validate such promises but one who had 'writ the sacred word with an immortal pen'?

So far from God being an un-related First Cause, and man a creature dwarfed and lost in so vast a universe, it was man whom God made to be the culmination of all else.

*He formed the stars, those heavenly flames,
He counts their numbers, calls their names;
His wisdom's vast, and knows no bound,
A deep where all our thoughts are drowned.*

*But saints are lovely in His sight,
He views His children with delight,
He sees their hope, He knows their fear,
And looks, and loves His image there.**

And again,

*The whole creation is Thy charge,
But saints are Thy peculiar care.⁷*

*The Heavens declare Thy glory, Lord,
In every star Thy wisdom shines,
But when our eyes behold Thy word,
We read Thy name in fairer lines.**

The Newtonian note sounds clearly in the large world-embracing sweep of Watts's missionary hymns—and this at a time when missionary interest was anything but strong. It must suffice here to recall

*Jesus shall reign where'er the sun
Doth his successive journeys run,⁸*

a hymn which he wrote 'in an ecstasy'.

⁵ *ibid.*, No. 58.

⁶ *ibid.*, No. 79.

⁷ *ibid.*, No. 48.

⁸ *ibid.*, No. 802.

⁹ *ibid.*, No. 272.

God was no *anima mundi*, the maker, yet the prisoner, of His world.

*But nothing like Thyself appears
Through all these spacious works of Thine.*

*Still restless nature dies and grows,
From change to change the creatures run:
Thy being no succession knows,
And all Thy vast designs are one.¹⁰*

God's sovereign Grace moves Watts to an even deeper wonder than His sovereign Power. What can surpass the exquisite tenderness of 'My soul, repeat His praise', with its emphasis upon the Divine patience and pity:

*High as the heavens are raised
Above the ground we tread,
So far the riches of His grace
Our highest thoughts exceed.¹¹*

There is one stanza in which Watts arrestingly reconciles the two realms of Power and Grace—

*His every word of grace is strong
As that which built the skies;
The voice that rolls the stars along
Speaks all the promises.¹²*

Here Isaac Newton becomes Bunyan's Evangelist. For what would 'the promises of grace' be worth, spoken by any lesser Deity?

No matter how gracious and intimate Watts's theme may be, the cosmic background is always there. Always he gives us a sense of the spaciousness of nature, the vastness of time, the dreadfulness of eternity; perhaps nowhere more eloquently than in the hymn which has become our sacred national anthem: 'O God our help in ages past.' He draws a picture of 'the busy tribes of flesh and blood' living out their brief day—'Short as the watch that ends the night. Before the rising sun'; before our eyes they are hurried away on Time's 'ever-rolling stream'; and this pitiful human life, 'a tale that is told', a dream that 'dies at the opening day,' is placed against the tremendous, yet consoling, background of God, our help and hope, 'Our shelter from that stormy blast, And our eternal home'.

So long as men are religious they will treasure the hymns of Isaac Watts, sublime as Milton, tender as Cowper, rapturous as Wesley. It was a happy result of broadmindedness that from the first Watts's outstanding hymns were welcomed into the *Methodist Hymn-book*. Whether John Wesley had the conscious intention or no, Watts's hymns are a wholesome complement to Charles Wesley's. Wesley is emphatically subjective, concerning himself with God and the soul of man—their original affinity, their estrangement, their reconciliation, their union. These themes being fundamental of Christianity, are of course handled by Watts—but with a difference. Partly as a Calvinist, partly as a man under the spell of Newton, Watts places the drama of the soul, in its several acts, in a cosmic setting. We are always aware of a lofty philosophic approach.

¹⁰ *M.H.B.*, No. 41.

¹¹ *ibid.*, No. 54.

¹² *ibid.*, No. 72.

Yet the last word of Isaac Watts is that of Old Honest, 'Grace reigns.' Astronomical glories pale before the miracles of grace. The love of God was older than the universe. With Wesley, he puts the Cross in the centre. In the words of Bernard Manning, 'Watts sees the Cross, as Milton had seen it, planted on a globe hung in space, surrounded by the vast distances of the universe.' Before the beginning of time the Scheme of Redemption was prepared; and when time has ceased to be, the Lamb 'as it had been slain' will stand in the midst of the eternal throne.

*The whole creation join in one
To bless the sacred name
Of Him that sits upon the throne,
And to adore the Lamb.¹³*

In his best known and greatest hymn—'When I survey the wondrous Cross', a hymn that in Heaven will be dear to St. Francis and St. Teresa, for it breathes the very spirit of Catholic devotion; in the midst of the hushed adoration of the Crucified, the cosmic Newtonian note is there:

Were the whole realm of Nature mine.¹⁴

This is quintessential Watts. It is an echo of his encyclopedic thought, a reflection of his preoccupation with stellar magnitudes. Surveying 'the whole realm of Nature', he finds that its pivot is the Creator crucified. That this is no fanciful interpretation is proved by the verse unaccountably omitted in most books,

*His dying crimson like a robe
Spreads o'er His body on the Tree,
Then am I dead to all the globe,
And all the globe is dead to me.*

Here at Calvary is set forth the meaning of 'the whole world'. Eternity is concentrated into an hour. 'Survey' is an astronomical, a star-gazer's word. William Temple, preaching in St. Paul's to Pan-Anglican bishops and representatives, told us that his father's test of preaching was that the sermon should make the same sort of impression on the audience as would a lecture on the starry heavens given by an inspired Astronomer Royal. Watts would pass Frederick Temple's test. He realized the *sublimity* of the Gospel. That sublimity was sometimes lost in the intense examination of the human soul that marked the evangelical and pietist movements. Watts preserved the sublimity, yet with no surrender of the personal note. He thus performed a vital service. All that was good in the Newtonian approach to the wonders of creation Watts jealously guarded. Such strength and dignity are a corrective of the familiarity and sentimentality to which popular Christianity tends to degenerate. On the other hand he avoided the perilous Deistic perversions of Newtonian transcendence. The 'Sovereign King of Glory' was no impersonal First Cause. He was 'my Father and my Friend'. His name was written 'in fairer lines' than even those of the stars in their courses.

¹³ *ibid.*, No. 85.

¹⁴ *ibid.*, No. 182.

Watts's final vision is of a terrestrial globe revolving in space; and on it there stands the

wondrous Cross
On which the Prince of Glory died.

Divine Sovereignty merges into Holy Fatherhood. Our world with 'its busy tribes' moves on its appointed way not only under the compulsion of Gravity but under the diviner sway of Grace. And thus, in the hands of Isaac Watts, that other Isaac, the Lord of Science, becomes a servant of the Gospel.

F. BROMPTON HARVEY

ONE OF OUR CONQUERORS¹

The Works and Faith of Bernard Shaw

THERE IS no royal road to Shavianism. . . . The mess of plays, prefaces, tracts, and articles, from which my philosophy has to be extracted is not only the form imposed by circumstances, but the only form in which it can be properly assimilated. I have no time to boil myself down; and anyhow I could not do so and preserve all the necessary nutriment and the flavouring on which the digestibility depends.' This was Bernard Shaw's answer to a proposal by Hesketh Pearson for the compiling of a Quintessence of Shavianism, or Golden Treasury of 'selected passages', which would serve as a sort of compendium of his teachings. It is exactly what we should expect any artist to say about such a project. In a serious work of art a philosophy of some sort is always implicit. It avoids dogmatism, but in a tentative fashion it does put forward some interpretation of human experience in an enigmatic world. But the artist is a myth-maker, not a systematic thinker. He knows that the well in which truth is hidden is very deep indeed, and no rope of logic ever yet woven has got to the bottom of it. He is content therefore to teach by suggestion, seeks rather to persuade than to argue, does not attempt to do our thinking for us, and would have us walk by faith and not by sight. It may even be that, with the fading of the insight out of which his myth arose, he himself will not be altogether certain what to make of it, as Browning, according to the familiar story, said that God only knew the meaning of *Sordello*. It is therefore always a hazardous venture to attempt to deduce a creed from a work of art.

But Bernard Shaw is a peculiar case. He is the most didactic artist that ever lived. Not only is he always sure himself of what he is getting at, but he is determined that there shall be no possibility of doubt in the mind of anyone else. He is his own interpreter and goes to any amount of trouble to make everything plain. It is not enough to drill his actors, the audience also must be put through their paces, and everything that is left unsaid in the play is made explicit in the preface. He is, as Chesterton said of him, 'a very prefatory sort

¹ Continued from p. 19 (January 1949).

of person. He always gives the explanation before the incident'. Nothing is left to chance. He provides both text and commentary, writes his own gospel and preaches the official sermon before anyone else has a chance to misinterpret it. All the expositors have been anticipated, for there is only one man who can be trusted to explain the Shavian philosophy, and that man is George Bernard Shaw.

It must be confessed that this passion for explaining himself with unsparing thoroughness and often at inordinate length is a little tiresome at times. Even his meekest disciples must occasionally wish that he would leave something to their intelligence. We cannot complain that he does not make his lessons interesting, but he is always the Head Master, and the mere fact that he takes such a lot of trouble over us leaves us in the end a bit depressed; we come to feel that he is a conscientious teacher doing his best with a class of very backward boys. But it seems that he cannot help himself. A lady who had been his hostess for a weekend is said to have complained afterwards that the visit did not turn out at all as she had intended. 'You invite him down to your place because you think he will entertain your guests with his brilliant conversation, and before you know where you are he has chosen a school for your son, made your will for you, regulated your diet, and assumed all the privileges of your family solicitor, your housekeeper, your clergyman, your doctor, your dress-maker, your hairdresser, and your estate agent. When he has finished with everybody else, he incites your children to rebellion. And when he can find nothing more to do, he goes off and forgets all about you.' We can well believe it, for it is in the same spirit of despotic benevolence that he goes about his chosen task of putting the whole world right.

It is characteristic, for example, that all the well-meaning people in the plays are persons of an authoritative temper—to put it very mildly indeed; their intentions are good, but their methods are peremptory. He must find it hard to believe that the meek shall inherit the earth, but there is no doubt about his conviction that the Kingdom of Heaven suffereth violence, or that men of violence take it by force. The Christian martyrs in *Androcles and the Lion* are holy terrors; Lavinia scarifies her persecutors with withering back-chat, and Ferrovius almost persuades the patrician Lentulus to be a Christian, but unfortunately frightens him into a fit before he has got him quite converted. Todger Fairmile, the reformed pugilist in *Major Barbara*, wrestles in prayer for the soul of Bill Walker while kneeling on his head in the snow; and Major Barbara herself brings sinners to repentance by what can only be described as a technique of moral intimidation. St. Joan is equally masterful—'a hardy, managing type', as Shaw describes her in the preface to the play, 'very capable: a born boss'.

You cannot expect to do good unless you are prepared to take strong measures: on that point he is quite explicit. To say that you cannot make men good by Act of Parliament is nonsense; you cannot make them good in any other way. He is always insisting that 'we must reform society before we can reform ourselves'. Righteousness is not a matter that you can leave to the individual—least of all Christian righteousness. Anyone who tried to live the life of a thorough-paced Christian with the world as it is would quickly find that he was prevented from doing so by the mere fact that society as a whole is not

organized on a basis of Christian morality. 'The rich man must sell up not only himself but his whole class; and that could be done only through the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The disciple cannot have his bread without money until there is bread for everybody without money; and that requires an elaborate municipal organization of the food supply, rate aided.'² The whole of the closely-reasoned argument of the *Androcles* Preface is aimed against the idea that Christian ethics are concerned mainly, not to say entirely, with personal conduct; that the focus of their claim is the conscience of the individual. Work them out logically (and if you cannot do it for yourself he kindly does it for you) and you will see that they imply an economic revolution. It is not within the ability of private persons to put them into effect. That is work for a central executive armed with authority and backed by a police force. Christian morals could not be made to prevail in any other way than by force of law, and that, in the last resort, would and must entail the coercion of those who, if it were a matter of personal choice, would certainly not be willing to fall in with the demands of the Sermon on the Mount.

For the same reason he refuses—except when it suits him for the purpose of argument—to pay lip-service to the democratic idea. Popular government is never likely to be good government, for the simple reason that the people never know what is good for them; they only know what they want. In practice democracy is tolerable only because it is mostly a sham. If the men that it puts into power really carried out the will of the people, as they profess to do, life would hardly be worth living—at all events for Bernard Shaw. The most closely-guarded of all Cabinet secrets—until Mr. Baldwin blurted it out—is that the people must be deceived for their own good; it is what every Government is bound to do, for it is the only way to manage a democracy. Abraham Lincoln's definition of democracy is only two-thirds true. Government of the people?—of course; it is most necessary. *For* the people?—by all means; that indeed should be the sole aim of government. But *by* the people?—impossible; it simply can't be done. 'Government *by* the people is not and never can be a reality: it is only a cry by which demagogues humbug us into voting for them. If you doubt this—if you ask me, "Why should not the people make their own laws?"', I need only ask you: "Why should not the people write their own plays?" They cannot. It is much easier to write a good play than to make a good law. And there are not a hundred men in the world who can write a play good enough to stand daily wear-and-tear as long as a law must.'³ To run even a comparatively small country like Britain, with a population of only forty-odd million, is not a task which can be done offhand like any unskilled job. The elected persons who are nominally at the head of our affairs are mostly amateurs, but their inadequacy is mercifully screened from sight by the experts of the Civil Service, on whose advice they must constantly depend and by whom the effective day-to-day administration of the country's affairs is carried on. And the Civil Service is not appointed by popular vote. Bureaucracy is a term of abuse, but though it is easy to give a dog a bad name, you would be in a devil of a mess if you were fools enough to hang him. What would become of the sheep if there were no dog to round them up and keep them together?

² Preface to *Androcles and the Lion*.

³ Preface to *The Apple Cart*.

The trouble with Shaw is that his reasoning is too conclusive to carry conviction. Against such an overwhelming barrage of logic we fly to the shelter of scepticism. Things cannot be as beautifully clear as he insists on making them; it is not in nature. In the end we are more than half convinced that he is arguing for argument's sake—for the intellectual pleasure of making out an unanswerable case; he doesn't really mean what he says, it is only 'pretty Fanny's way'. As long as democracy held the field and appeared to be unassailable we felt that we could afford to treat his outrageous notions as the amusing persiflage of a witty man. But in the light of all that has happened in Europe we are no longer amused. It now appears that he meant every word of it. He was not merely toying with Marxism but very artfully insinuating it into the blood-stream of the body politic; his wit is a deadly wit. The principle that men can only be made good by Act of Parliament is the beginning of totalitarianism. It is for our masters to decide what is good for us, and, having decided, to take all necessary measures to make us behave ourselves accordingly. And if, as he says, Parliament is only the façade which our masters use as a screen, they will make very short work of it when they judge that the time is ripe to come out into the open. Democracy, if they still use the word, will then mean whatever they choose it to mean. Anything that *they* decide will be the will of the people. And they will see to it that the people are unanimous. There will be no Opposition.

No one will doubt that Shaw's own intentions are good and his motives quite disinterested, but it is to be presumed that he has never meant to propose himself as a dictator; in any case he is hardly likely to feel quite up to it now. That is the trouble with the philosophic revolutionists; they do the thinking, but cannot give any guarantee that those who act on their ideas will carry out their good intentions. It is all very well to call up spirits from the vasty deep, but what sort of spirits will answer the summons? There is no such thing as a benevolent despot. Even if they are well meaning to begin with, dictators quickly discover that benevolence is a moral luxury which they cannot afford. It is possible—just possible—to imagine a dictator who took Shaw's idea seriously and made an honest attempt to impose the ethics of Jesus by force of law; but it would not be long before he was driven to employ the methods of Torquemada and the Inquisition, of Himmler and the Gestapo, of the Politburo and the Russian secret police. But of course Shaw's argument is double-edged. If, as he says, you can force good morals on the people, you can also force bad morals on them. That indeed would be the easier task of the two, for with human nature as it is they would respond more readily to an appeal to their passions than to their virtues. In any case it means that the State must decide what is right and what is wrong; and if the authority of the State is unlimited it can always, if it chooses, find means to trick or to coerce the people into saying, Evil, be thou my good. That is what has happened in all the totalitarian countries.

Shaw's 'special subjects', according to the reference books, are Politics and Religion. From what has already been said it will be clear that he does not separate the two. The implications of religion must be worked out in the field of politics, for politics is a sort of realized religion, a progressive building-up of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. And what is true of politics is true of every other

human activity. Religion is not a department of life, it is life itself, life in all its abundance and diversity, the sum-total of all that men are striving to do in all their labours under the sun. He is the Preacher who lifts up his voice not in the pulpit but in the street and exhorts his congregation to recognize that their secular occupations are holy and they themselves God's fellow-workers. 'Behold,' he cries to them, 'these things are not vanity, neither do ye vex your spirit and spend your strength for nought. To think that is a blasphemy never to be condoned, the sin against life, which is the sin against the Holy Ghost.' Therefore he will have no truck with the doctrine of *L'art pour l'art*. For the mere belletrist, the man who has nothing to say and says it exquisitely, he has unbounded contempt. Art that is not didactic is simply elegant trifling. 'No doubt I must recognize, as even the Ancient Mariner did, that I must tell my story entertainingly if I am to hold the wedding-guest spellbound in spite of the siren sounds of the loud bassoon. But "for art's sake" alone I would not face the toil of writing a single sentence. I know that there are men who, having nothing to say and nothing to write, are nevertheless so in love with oratory and with literature that they delight in repeating as much as they can understand of what others have said or written aforetime. I know that the leisurely tricks which their want of conviction leaves them free to play with the diluted and misapprehended message supply them with a pleasant parlour game which they call style. I can pity their dotage and even sympathize with their fancy. But a true original style is never achieved for its own sake.'⁴

His worst enemies would agree that Shaw has no false modesty; they would merely omit the adjective. But if he is fully aware of his own genius, he is no less conscious of the responsibilities of genius. It is to him what his 'Daimon' was to Socrates—something greater than himself, a Power of which he would not dare to say that he possesses it, but rather that it possesses him. That is why he can speak of it with simple unself-consciousness; his pretensions to genius are no more vainglorious than the pretensions of the prophet who says: Thus saith the Lord. There is something that seeks expression and he is the servant of the word; if he fails it it will not find utterance. This is the function for which men of genius are all in their several ways employed, and their particular talent, whatever it may be, is to be cultivated not for its own sake but as the organ of the mystery that waits to be revealed. Though he scorns the practise of style as the be-all and end-all of art—the style that is only a 'parlour game'—he is himself a stylist of the highest order, a craftsman whose conscience will not tolerate fumbling workmanship. The message that he has to deliver demands of him the utmost lucidity of utterance, the deployment of every device of persuasion, the athletic vigour and dexterity which alone insures that every punch will have its full effect. He is not afraid of the word 'message'; a man may have all the talents, but if he has no message he is sounding brass, a tinkling cymbal. It is the artist-philosopher alone who is significant. Judged by this high standard even Shakespeare and Dickens fall under condemnation. 'I read Dickens and Shakespeare without shame or stint; but their pregnant observations and demonstrations of life are not co-ordinated into any philosophy or religion. . . . They have no constructive ideas: in all their fictions there is

⁴ Epistle Dedicatory to *Man and Superman*.

no leading thought or inspiration for which any man could conceivably risk the spoiling of his hat in a shower, much less his life.'⁶

And yet, when all is said and done, the most valuable contribution which the artist makes is not his philosophy. Although he will never do work that counts for much unless he is trying to express something which he himself sincerely and urgently believes, no teacher is infallible and no philosophy final. Dogmatic as he is, Shaw does recognize that it has not been left to him to speak the last word and bring all thought to a stop. He professes to be under no delusion 'as to the permanence of those forms of thought (call them opinions) by which I try to communicate my bent to my fellows. To younger men they are already outmoded.' In the end his work will stand, if at all, by its 'temper and energy'. That is true of every artist. Their value to the world lies in the fact that they are building up the racial consciousness, clarifying and raising it, bringing it to a heightened intensity and an ever-widening awareness. It may even be that the philosophy is false: no matter; we must know both good and evil—how otherwise are we to distinguish between them? The false prophets also have their value, provided always that they sincerely believe in the gods they serve. Let the Proverbs of Hell stand side-by-side with the Beatitudes.

The artist, in fact, is the Pygmalion who warms and animates the stony image and breathes into its nostrils the breath of life. He works the miracle which Higgins, the professor of phonetics, worked on Eliza Doolittle. He makes the mere lump of instincts and appetites which is human nature in the raw conscious of itself and gives it the means to utter its thought. Higgins did better than he knew. He set out, quite callously, merely for the sake of a bet, to prove that within a given time he could pass the flower-girl off for a duchess. Having won his bet he is quite prepared to discard her; for all he cares she can go back to the gutter and the cabbage-stalks in Drury Lane. What he has not reckoned with is the fact that the girl he has taught to talk like a duchess can never again be Eliza Doolittle. He has given her language, as Prospero did to Caliban; but the gift of language is the gift of a soul. The new Eliza is not a talking doll; she is not a mere creature of Higgins's and a hollow echo of his voice. He has put ideas into her head, but they have fertilized her mind and given birth to ideas of her own. And that is the proper function of the artist: not to do our thinking for us, but to blow our smouldering and murky intelligence into flame.

It may be worth while to remark in passing that this seems to be the answer to Shaw's rather querulous criticism of Dickens and Shakespeare. He must be the only man who ever found fault with them because they had no cut-and-dried philosophy. Most of us are only too thankful that they were not systematic thinkers, and we are pretty sure that it is not because they were too stupid, but because they were too wise. He has pointed out that Dickens and Karl Marx were contemporaries, and he seems to think it a pity that they never met—it would have been so good for Dickens! Most of us will share his regret, but for the opposite reason: it would have been so good for Karl Marx. In any case, the works of Shakespeare and of Dickens are a quarry from which the raw material of any number of philosophies can be hewn. They have given us something better than theories about life; they have given us insight into life,

⁶ *ibid.*

its moral springs, its limitless capacities for good and for evil. What more should we ask of them? They have done what Shaw himself in his wiser moments recognizes to be the essential work of an imaginative writer, they have nursed and fostered our consciousness.

We must however take Shaw as we find him. He is both artist and philosopher, and in that sense—but in that sense alone—a double-minded man. It is a need of his nature to do all that he can to bring his intuitions into the light of reason; not merely to give them symbolic expression, as the pure artist is content to do, but to fix them in a dogmatic statement. In one sense he is a mystic, responding, as all naturally religious men do, to the sense of a 'Something not ourselves'—a man in communion with the unseen. But belief in a Something not ourselves is at best an agnostic belief; if we are sure of so much, must we not go on to discover *what* that Something is? Shaw at any rate finds himself under that necessity. The theologian comes to the aid of the mystic, the dogmatist lends the agnostic a helping hand. We have seen that he is conscious of being *used*, of his genius as being greater than himself, a power that works in him, seeking its own fulfilment. But he is not content with that; his altar is not erected to an unknown god.

The form under which he has formulated his intuition is the doctrine of the Life Force. Like all thinking men of his generation he had been caught up in the great evolutionary controversy which was the most momentous question on which they were called upon to make up their minds. As between popular religion and the new interpretation of the world-process he had no doubt on which side the truth lay. But the evolutionists were divided among themselves. There were those who held with Lamarck that selection is a conscious process, a matter of choice and will. New species are evolved under the compulsion of some inward driving-force so strong that, in course of time, it brings about modifications of the living organism. To take the stock illustration, a creature like an antelope desires—for some reason that is not explained—to feed on the tender foliage of trees instead of on grass, and by dint of wanting and trying, in an effort that is sustained through many generations, he elongates his neck out of all proportion until he is transformed into that specialized kind of antelope which we call a giraffe. An antelope's reach should exceed his grasp, or what future is there for him? And, says Shaw, 'if this sort of selection could turn an antelope into a giraffe, it could conceivably turn a pond full of amoebas into the French Academy'. The Darwinians, on the other hand, held that structural changes are not brought about by any conscious purpose on the part of the animal, or of some superior power controlling it and working through it, but by the blind play of purely external influences. It is all sufficiently explained by the simple fact that the weakest go to the wall. There is no need to postulate will or purpose. In the struggle for existence only those who can adapt themselves to the conditions in which they are placed survive; the rest die off. Nature does in a mindless and unwitting fashion what the pigeon-fancier, the stock-breeder, the stud-groom does deliberately. It breeds and selects, gives rise to changes, forces improvements, by the sheer pressure of brute necessity. It is Circumstantial Selection pure and simple, brought about by accident, not design.

Darwin himself had little idea of the fundamental questions that were

involved in his theory. He was a naturalist and observer, not a philosopher, and his ideas appealed to the majority because they, like himself, were content with plain facts and assumed that they were self-explanatory. It was left very largely to Samuel Butler to show what a nightmare vision it was that his 'explanation' presented to the imagination; he had 'banished mind from the universe'. Shaw seems to have approached the question through Butler and he shares his horror to the full. 'To call this Natural Selection', he says in the Preface to *Back to Methuselah*, 'is a blasphemy, possible to many for whom Nature is nothing but a casual aggregation of inert and dead matter, but eternally impossible to the spirits and souls of the righteous.' His own belief, that there is a creative spirit surging through all the modes of existence that appear upon earth, seeking always to realize itself and struggling toward full expression by a method of trial and error, he owed partly to Shelley, the one poet of whom he speaks with reverence, and partly to the vitalistic philosophy of Bergson; and he has lived to see it vindicated in the theory of Creative Evolution which has largely replaced Darwin's mechanistic explanation of the evolutionary process.

It is in the Preface to *Back to Methuselah* that the doctrine of the Life Force is most fully expounded. Anyone who supposes that brilliant writing can only go with shallow thinking—that obscurity is the hallmark of wisdom—may be recommended to read this masterpiece of exposition. It is true that Shaw is not original in the sense that he has initiated new ideas. He is a man of supreme intelligence who seizes on the suggestions of others and clarifies and lights them up—a middle-man of ideas, a popularizer and an evangelist. That is a function which only fools and prigs will affect to despise. If ideas are worth anything at all they should be put into circulation, for 'how shall they hear without a preacher?' Nor would Shaw hesitate to complete the quotation: 'And how shall they preach except they be sent?' He is an utterly serious man conscious of his genius as a constraining gift of prophecy to which he devotes himself without stint or reservation. He is himself in the grip of the Life Force.

To quicken and to stimulate, to foster life at the highest level, to promote intelligence and to moralize society—that is the work to which he, to which every man in his measure, is called. But it is a task that has to be discharged under the shadow of a great discouragement. All human endeavour is brought up short by a fatal bar; across its path is flung the stumbling-block of death, that brings all effort to an end. The next step in the evolutionary advance is in sight: after man, the Superman. But at present we do not will it with sufficient strength and hope and ardour to render us fit to go forward; the vital drive has not yet gathered enough urgency to make it truly creative. And the reason is that we are deeply discouraged. To a far greater degree than we realize our souls are chilled and our faculties numbed by the foreknowledge of imminent death. We are unable to rouse ourselves to that degree of spiritual activity—sanguine imagination, strenuous thought, sustained and purposeful endeavour—which we need to put forth if we are to bring about lasting improvements in society and in human nature itself. 'It is a law of Nature', declares one of the new race of longlivers in *Back to Methuselah*, 'that there is a fixed relation between conduct and length of life. . . . To a longliver every extra year is a prospect continually forcing him to stretch his faculties to the

utmost to meet it.' This cycle of plays is in fact a sustained lay-sermon on the text: 'What man is he that desireth life, and loveth many days, that he may see good?'; and a writer who is also a preacher may permit himself to remark with some satisfaction that one layman at least outrageously defies the popular demand for short sermons!

The *Methuselah* cycle, together with *Man and Superman*, may be taken as the Testament of Shaw's religious beliefs; and in *Saint Joan* and the other religious plays the same faith is implicit, though in these it is not placed in the centre of interest. It is of course easy enough to state objections to his theories. Matter-of-fact persons will no doubt treat them lightly as a fanciful speculation with no substance in it, but all religious ideas are fantastic to the literal-minded. Their pantheistic tendency is evident enough, but that is a character which they share with every statement of the doctrine of divine immanence, and with almost every form of mystical belief. On a more practical level it is open to doubt whether the extension of what the insurance companies call the 'expectation of life' to several centuries instead of seven decades or so would result in such a bracing of the mental and moral faculties as he supposes it would bring about. If people will quite cheerfully waste even a short life, are they not likely to be still more careless when they feel that they have any amount of time to play about with? The serious-minded will always take life seriously, whether it is short or long; the easygoing and the frivolous will be playboys even when they have one foot in the grave. These and other objections will readily occur to anyone who gives the matter five minutes' thought. But again we must remember that Shaw, while there is no doubt about the sincerity of his own conviction, does not pretend to have spoken the last word. He believes his doctrine to be true in substance, but like any other religious belief it must be received in faith, for religion is concerned with an order of reality where proof is impossible. He has stated his conviction in his own way, but it is not the only way, and not necessarily the best.

What we must gratefully recognize in him is his faith in life, the positive manner in which he affirms its value, his declaration that it has meaning and a purpose, his rousing summons to every man to whom the precious gifts of life and consciousness have been given to further its highest ends and to add all his strength to the sum-total of creative effort. Life, and life more abundantly, always at its best and always raising itself to a higher pitch—that is the way of salvation that he preaches to us all. Heretic he may be, but to him the deadliest of all sins is scepticism, the most certain of all truths is that we are saved by faith. His mind has been nourished on the Bible and on Bunyan. He is at one with them in his conviction that the supreme enemies of God and of man are the life-deniers—the pessimists, the shirkers, and the cowards. His condemnation of them is the condemnation of the Apocalypse: 'For the fearful and the unbelieving, their part shall be in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death.' Few people will agree with all his opinions; some of them we may even detest: but in the end it is not his opinions that matter. It is the positive affirmation of a magnificent faith, faith in the value of life. That is the last word of *Back to Methuselah*, spoken through the lips of Lilith: 'They have accepted the burden of eternal life. . . . They have redeemed themselves from their vileness, and turned away from their sins. Best of all,

they are still not satisfied: the impulse I gave them in that day when I sundered myself in twain and launched Man and Woman on the earth still urges them: after passing a million goals they press on to the goal of redemption from the flesh, to the vortex freed from matter, to the whirlpool in pure intelligence that, when the world began, was a whirlpool in pure force. And though all that they have done seems but the first hour of the infinite work of creation, yet I will not supersede them until they have forded this last stream between flesh and spirit, and disentangled their life from the matter that has always mocked it. . . . Of Life only there is no end; and though of its million starry mansions many are empty and many still unbuilt, and though its vast domain is as yet unbearably desert, my seed shall one day fill it and master its matter to its uttermost confines. And for what may be beyond, the eyesight of Lilith is too short. It is enough that there is a beyond.'

From pure force to pure intelligence—that is the span of evolution, the path which man, the pilgrim of eternity, must set himself to travel. By creative effort, by perpetual self-renewal, in co-operation and fellowship with all the pilgrim-company, the weak and the strong alike, he is to go on from strength to strength. Nor is he alone and unaided. The impulse comes from beyond himself; a power is working in him that is more than his own. Call it what you will—the Life Force if you cannot bring yourself to name the Name of God. To believe in it under whatever name is to have a religion; to yield yourself to its constraining power is to be God's fellow-worker.

W. S. HANDLEY JONES

CHRISTIAN INITIATION

Some Recent Anglican Discussion

THERE HAS of late been a striking growth of concern in the Church of England about what is now called—perhaps not altogether happily—'Christian Initiation', both in its doctrine and in its practice. By this term is signified the entry of the believer into the membership and supernatural life of the Church, effected in certain symbolical rites. These rites of initiation, in Anglican usage, are baptism and the laying-on of hands in confirmation. The present widespread discussion bears upon their meaning, singly and in relation to one another, and upon the conditions to which their due administration is or should be subject. The fact which many of the clergy and faithful laity find so disquieting is that deep-rooted custom, heedless of the radically changed circumstances of our age, requires the imparting of one or both of these sacred gifts to large numbers of persons whose Christianity and Church membership will probably never be more than merely nominal and formal. It would, I think, be no exaggeration to say that in the Church of England today this matter, with all that it implies, has attained to a priority of interest, and a committee of the recent Lambeth Conference was expressly appointed to

deal with it. 'Christian Initiation' thus appears in the first instance as a practical problem, arising out of the day-to-day experience of the parish clergy. But it has very soon been seen, even by those who have no aptitude for speculative questions, to involve a still deeper problem of doctrine. In fact, the relevance of the theology of baptism to the work and witness of the Church at the present time is now obvious. It is sometimes said indeed that as in the last century the Church of England rediscovered for herself the meaning of the Eucharist so in this she has been guided to rediscover that of baptism. In face of existing conditions we are obliged to ask ourselves where (so to speak) 'Christianity' ends and the secular order begins, what it means for the individual to be a Christian and what the act of becoming one may be said to consist in. The answers to such questions bring us, as is at once evident, straight into the whole complex problem of the *Church*, its nature, function, and extent, and its relation to the community at large. Christian institutions must take full account of the prevailing circumstance that we live in a society which is neither Christian nor in any positive sense anti-Christian, but—to use the current expression—'post-Christian'. Or at any rate, though our society may be designated Christian in so far as it is anything at all, its Christianity is nevertheless only vestigial, and though most people would not, one may suppose, actually affirm that they are not Christians, it cannot be claimed that their Christianity amounts to a personal conviction or even to a retained habit of life. Yet year after year thousands of infants are baptized at the Church's fonts, and so, in name at least, enter upon the Christian heritage. An increasing number of the clergy are asking how far this 'indiscriminate' bestowal of sacramental grace and the rights of Church membership may be reconciled with a good conscience and the precedents of the New Testament and the primitive Church. Certainly the parish priest finds it hard to avoid the conclusion that in the vast majority of cases—and it has been estimated that during the period 1913 to 1936 the average number of infant baptisms in the Church of England (and of Wales) was as high as 67.2 per cent. of the total births—the motives which prompt average parents to bring their children to the christening are inadequate. They do so partly in unthinking pursuance of convention, partly from superstition.

Much the same is often felt in regard to confirmation. It is true that far fewer seek it, and we may assume that they who do, acquire under instruction (which is usually carefully and conscientiously given) some knowledge at least of its doctrinal import. But the instances of lapse are exceedingly numerous, the greater proportion of those who receive confirmation ceasing sooner or later to attend communion. Thus figures based on a period of twelve years (1925 to 1936) reveal that 41 per cent. of those baptized were subsequently confirmed and that the approximate number of confirmed members of the Church of England is over seven millions; yet the total number of Easter communicants is roughly no more than two and a half millions or 35 per cent. of the confirmed. The Church is faced therefore with the problem of the 65 per cent. who have lapsed altogether and who swell the ranks of her 'nominal' or 'non-practising' members. The Lambeth Conference, in its committee report, could not but admit that the present situation is far from satisfactory and that there is 'great need for reconsideration of what is required' if the administration of these initiatory rites is to be 'adequate for their importance

and solemnity'.¹ There is a hardening opinion in the Church, and one not confined to the clergy alone, that a much firmer line needs to be drawn between the 'Church' and the 'world', and that the Church's discipline in the matter of admission to her membership should be a good deal stricter. An organized 'Baptismal Reform' movement has lately arisen to give expression to this view and to press for changes. It was moreover the pastoral difficulties which occasioned the appointment of Joint Committees of the Convocations of Canterbury and York on confirmation. The Schedule, entitled *Confirmation Today*, attached to the Interim Reports of these committees, has awakened a remarkable degree of interest and has itself come under fire of theological criticism from various quarters.²

But I should not omit to mention another and deeper reason for reconsideration of the doctrine and practice of baptism-confirmation, and one which concerns the reorientation of theological thought that has taken place within recent years. The conditions of the modern world are such as to arouse among Christians—and I fancy that all denominations have been to some extent affected—a renewed sense of the *Ecclesia* of God. 'The topic of the Church', it has been said, 'bids fair to play in the intellectual history of Christendom in our twentieth century that dominant part which the topic of the Incarnation played in the fourth and fifth centuries.'³ The contrast, so familiar to Christians in primitive times, of the 'Church', the congregation of the faithful, with the whole order of secular society, of this age with the age to come *beyond history*, is becoming manifest once again. In the past, so it seems to some, the function and work of the Church have been conceived too much in terms of—in the literal meaning of the word—*secular* aims and opportunities, as part of an outlook which found its characteristic expression in eighteenth-century latitudinarianism and in the liberal theology and modernism of forty or fifty years ago. What strikes the Christian thinker now is the discontinuity, in so many vital respects, between any actual or possible world-order—all such are inevitably under judgement of God—and the order of 'supernature' or grace, to which the Church as the Body of Christ belongs. Christian initiation therefore has to be seen and interpreted with reference not only to the needs and occasions of this world but against the background of that 'apocalyptic' element in Christianity which in ancient days provided so powerful a motive in belief. 'It is the impact here and now upon the created soul of the eternal judgement of God, of a salvation which is also "an apocalypse" as St. Paul calls it "of the wrath of God upon all unrighteousness and ungodliness of men", including that of the initiate' himself.⁴ This contrast, which the events of our age bring out in such vivid colours, between an integral Christianity and the mind and habits of secular society, naturally obtrudes upon us a grave doubt as to the propriety of the Church's assuming, as apparently in certain important ways she still does, the basically Christian character of the community which she now has to confront.

The questions that are raised, then, are these: What is baptism, and what do

¹ *The Lambeth Conference, 1948* (S.P.C.K.), p. 111.

² Issued by the Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly, price 2s.

³ Dom Gregory Dix, O.S.B., *The Theology of Confirmation in Relation to Baptism* (London: Dacre Press, 1946), p. 5.

⁴ Dix, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

we believe it to effect? Are we justified in perpetuating the custom of infant baptism and if so on what grounds of doctrine? What is the significance of confirmation and what is its relation to baptism? The investigation of these matters must properly begin with the New Testament and the usage, so far as we have any certain knowledge of it, of the primitive Church.

Initiation, in the apostolic age, is not merely admission to a religious confraternity. It has as its background that eschatological belief of which we have just spoken. Man, so the teaching runs, is made one with Christ in His death and resurrection, his sin is forgiven, he is adopted into Sonship of God and sealed by the Spirit under the day of redemption. But though the facets of its meaning are many, *baptisma* is essentially *one* in what it effects and symbolizes. Those, accordingly, in the Church of England who desire reform feel that this primitive 'wholeness' or 'oneness' of belief and experience must be recaptured and that the times in which we live make it imperative for us to make the attempt.

The theologian of today has, of course, to face the further problem of the 'Dominical' institution of the sacrament, and in deference to a formidable weight of critical opinion he is probably no longer disposed to base his conviction that our Lord did verily institute the rite of baptism upon Matthew 28¹⁹ or John 3⁵. But it seems indisputable that baptism existed from the earliest days as an unquestioned element in Christian practice and that the apostles themselves believed it to have had at least the sanction if not the express command of their Master and to this the classical texts bear witness. And in the same connexion it may also be remarked that there is little or no justification on the basis of the New Testament evidence for contrasting a 'baptism in water'—except only that of John—with a 'baptism of the Spirit'. *Baptisma* includes as a characteristic feature immersion or 'cleansing' in water and in some way conjoined or related therewith the gift of the Holy Spirit.⁶

But as part, evidently, of the process of initiation there is another element, the laying-on of apostolic hands. In what respect was this connected with the water-rite? So far as the New Testament goes the testimony is admittedly ambiguous. We have certain passages, for instance, in which *baptisma* refers only to the latter, and the initiation is represented as incomplete without the gift of the Spirit conveyed in the laying-on of hands. The accounts in Acts of the baptism of the men of Ephesus and of the Samaritans,⁷ make this perfectly clear. There are others on the contrary which suggest that baptism in water is itself accompanied by the gift of the Holy Spirit, though it may very well be argued that these—Acts 2³⁸, 1 Corinthians 12¹³, 6¹¹, and Titus 3⁵—ought to be interpreted in the light of the foregoing, with the Spirit-gift in the imposition of hands not stated but plainly *implied*. Other passages, again—like Acts 8³⁹ or 16³³—leave it doubtful whether anything further was required in baptism than immersion in water. It is possible and perhaps most natural to conclude that the apostolic practice had not attained to any stereotyped pattern and that the only invariable element in the initiation ceremony was a cleansing in water. But of late the opinion has gained ground that the key to the New

⁶ The use of water was common to both John's baptism and the Christian rite; the distinguishing mark of the latter was the invocation of the name of Jesus.

⁷ 191-7 and 812-18 respectively.

Testament evidence is provided by the *liturgical tradition* of the early Church. Thus Dom Gregory Dix, of the Anglican Benedictine Community at Nashdom, claims that 'the liturgical evidence ought to be treated as absolutely primary, for it is older in its substance than any of the rest', being 'to some extent formative of Christian theological thought about the matter in the period before the New Testament documents were canonized'.⁷ He argues indeed that the liturgical tradition, as we see it in the light of modern scholarship, 'went back into the original Jewish root of Christianity in the Apostolic age with a directness that is not shared by all the elements that went to form the classical Christian mind'.

The earliest complete account of the initiatory rites in the post-apostolic age which has survived—the *Apostolic Tradition* of St. Hippolytus—furnishes us with an order of baptism which—as it is contended—derives from the early second century and possibly even from the first, and is thus as old as the apostolic *paradosis* of doctrine.⁸ In its details the work represents the practice of the Church of Rome toward the close of the second century. The stages of this initiation, as Hippolytus recounts them, are briefly as follows:⁹

The ceremony begins, after the night-long vigil of the *Pascha*, the Christian 'Passover', with a solemn blessing by the Bishop of the baptismal waters, the oil of exorcism, and the chrism. The candidates for baptism thereupon strip and renounce Satan, his service, and his works. Each in turn is anointed by a presbyter with the oil of exorcism, the latter repeating: 'Let all evil spirits depart from thee.' The candidates are then immersed in water. On leaving the water and after profession of faith in answer to a threefold credal interrogation each candidate is anointed on the head with chrism by a presbyter, 'in the name of Jesus Christ'. All the candidates then clothe themselves and stand before the Bishop, who lays his hands on them severally, with the words: 'O Lord God who hast counted these thy servants worthy of deserving the forgiveness of sins and the laver of regeneration, that they may serve thee according to thy holy will.' A further anointing takes place, this time by the Bishop himself, who lays his hand on the head of each, saying: 'I anoint thee with holy oil in God the Father Almighty and in Christ Jesus and in the Holy Ghost.' The final acts are the 'sealing' with the oil on the forehead and the kiss of peace. The Eucharist follows and the rite of initiation culminates in the reception by the newly-baptized of the holy sacrament.

The whole appears at first sight to fall into two parts: the immersion in and emergence from the water, signifying death unto sin and rising again to a new life; and the divine ratification, the seal of the Holy Ghost in the chrism and laying-on of hands. Yet it is not two ceremonies but one, the *sphragis* or 'seal'—the word *confirmatio* does not appear among the Latins until the fifth century—being an integral part of the 'baptism', and the Bishop, the successor of the apostles, is present throughout.

To us today this ritual seems elaborate, too elaborate, we are tempted to suppose, for the nascent years of the Church's life. Can it be affirmed, for

⁷ op cit., p. 9.

⁸ There are useful editions of this work by Dr. B. S. Easton, by Dom Dix himself, and by Dom B. Botte (*Sources chrétiennes*).

⁹ xxi and xxii.

example, that chrism was in use in apostolic times? But if Dom Dix is right in saying that in its main outlines it must be older than the separation of the Marcionites and the Valentinian and other Gnostic sects from the 'Great Church' we may conclude that a similar form of initiation existed in the sub-apostolic period. On the other hand there is meagre evidence for anything of the kind in the second-century writers, and the absence of any ritual other than water baptism in the account given by St. Justin Martyr in his *Apology* requires some explanation.¹⁰ The argument however that liturgical practice is relatively fixed and taken for granted has, I think, much weight; and in support of Hippolytus there is the well-known passage in Tertullian's *Liber de Baptismo*, a treatise roughly contemporary, in which the writer states explicitly: 'Not that in the waters we obtain the Holy Spirit, but that cleansed in the water we are prepared for the Spirit. . . . Leaving the laver we are forthwith anointed in the blessed oil . . . which lent its name to the Lord. The oil flows upon the flesh but profits the spirit . . . then a hand is laid upon us, by its blessing calling down and inviting the Holy Ghost.'¹¹ It is true that we find in the usage of Syria and Asia Minor some difference in the order of the ritual, viz. in the 'seal' and the 'baptism of the Spirit' preceding the immersion in water, though such may in fact have been the oldest usage of all;¹² and some uncertainty exists as to whether the actual 'seal' lay in the chrism or the imposition of the hand; but what Hippolytus describes is, we may fairly believe, the general pattern of baptism-confirmation in the ante-Nicene Church. And the crucial 'moment' in it is the imparting of the 'seal'.

It is natural therefore that Anglicans, for whom the 'catholic fathers and ancient bishops' ever have great authority, should now be disposed to review their present practice in the light of antiquity. The factor which has made all the difference, and which raises the kind of problem that vexes us today, is the growth of infant baptism.¹³ This was securely established by the time of St. Augustine's death in 430 and in the West resulted in the separation of baptism from confirmation by an interval of years. In the East the unity of the rite has been maintained to this day, but in conjunction with paedobaptism and therefore at the price of an all-important element in the Scriptural and ancient practice. 'The gain in preserving this unity', it is rightly said, 'is outweighed by the loss of the association of Christian initiation at any point with conscious faith and responsibility.'¹⁴ In the West the result of this separation, by a process which it is not difficult to trace, has led to a transformation of the

¹⁰ Vide the article 'Second-century Teaching on Holy Baptism', by Dr. J. E. L. Oulton (*Theology*, March 1947) and Dom G. Dix's reply (*Theology*, January 1948). The evidence of Justin has been dealt with by Professor E. C. Ratcliff (*Theology*, April 1948), who holds that 'Justin's statements may be said to reveal enough of that pattern of Christian initiation, which becomes familiar to us in and after the time of Tertullian and Hippolytus, to make it appear improbable that Justin regarded water-baptism as the whole of Christian initiation'.

¹¹ c.vi (quoted Dix, *op. cit.*, p. 14).

¹² Vide Professor T. W. Manson, 'Entry into Membership of the Early Church' (*Journal of Theological Studies*, January-April 1947).

¹³ 'It has been said with some force that it is infant Baptism rather than adult Confirmation which needs justification' (*Confirmation Today*, p. 13); cf. *Infant Baptism, History and Modern Practice* (S.P.C.K., 1939).

¹⁴ *The Theology of Christian Initiation*. The Report of a Theological Commission appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York (S.P.C.K., 1948), p. 14.

original meaning of *confirmatio* as the 'seal' into something without decisive soteriological import, for the teaching of the Church of England today differs little, in regard to confirmation, from that of St. Thomas Aquinas; in both it is an *augmentum gratiae*, an equipment for the struggle of living as a Christian. In the Church of Rome the divorce of confirmation from baptism is complete, the former being administered as a separate sacrament of strengthening, years after admission to the holy communion. Western Christianity has thus succeeded in throwing the whole burden of theological meaning in respect of its initiation rites upon baptism in water administered to infants. Is it any wonder that our customary practice, in the light of our professed doctrine, now seems to be leading to strange and anomalous consequences?

The Joint Committees of Convocation, the Schedule to whose Report has already been alluded to, made the mistake of attempting to tackle the practical difficulties without a serious re-examination of the history and theology of the rite; and it was soon to be criticized on this score by the Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Kirk,¹⁵ by Fr. L. S. Thornton, C. R.,¹⁶ and by Dom Gregory Dix in the remarkable paper from which I have quoted. The Report was content not only to take the traditional Western teaching on confirmation for granted but to make it the grounds for suggesting certain novel departures as to its administration.¹⁷ Fr. Thornton, while granting readily enough that confirmation is 'essentially an equipment for fulfilling our several vocations in the Church' insists—following the ancient idea—that it has 'a definite eschatological reference', and that the two aspects are really inseparable. For salvation, as he says, is not the private concern of the individual: it means 'the final integration of the whole man into that larger unity to which we are admitted in Christ and in which alone we become both sound and whole'.¹⁸ The fault, accordingly, with the customary doctrine of baptism-confirmation is that it is too *individualistic* and that it is *fragmentary*: the essential unity has been broken and the parts in their separation misunderstood. Fr. Thornton puts the matter in a nutshell when he says: 'Baptism has become the sufficient sacrament of salvation apart from the episcopal act which should be its culmination, whereas confirmation has almost ceased to be integral to the process of redemption as set forth in Scripture.'

All the same the traditional Anglican teaching has not gone undefended. Professor A. M. Ramsey of Durham, who acted for the Joint Committees in the part of the theological assessor, replied to the criticisms of the Bishop of Oxford, though without, it would seem to me, really meeting the latter's case;¹⁹ while

¹⁵ In articles in the *Oxford Diocesan Magazine* for November and December 1944, January 1945, and August 1946.

¹⁶ Vide *Confirmation Today*. An Address to the St. Albans Diocesan Synod, by L. S. Thornton, C.R., D.D. (Dacre Press, 1946); also the same author's *The Unity of Baptism and Confirmation in Scripture* (privately printed, n.d.), though his arguments seem to me at times somewhat fanciful.

¹⁷ It was thus proposed, as an alternative to the existing arrangement, to separate confirmation either from the ratification of vows, the latter to be postponed until the end of adolescence, or from admission to Holy Communion, following the modern Roman practice. Neither of these suggestions has found support and both were rejected by the Lambeth bishops (Resolution 103), as well as by the Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation.

¹⁸ It was in response to criticism of the theology of *Confirmation Today* that the Archbishops appointed a special commission to advise on the relations between baptism, confirmation, and holy communion.

¹⁹ L. S. Thornton, *Confirmation Today*, p. 10.

¹⁹ 'The Doctrine of Confirmation' (*Theology*, September 1945).

a paper by the Bishop of Derby, Dr. A. E. J. Rawlinson, came down rather heavily on the side of tradition.²⁰ He values confirmation as a 'fortification of the soul', as a rite with Scriptural warrant and of ancient though varied usage, and as 'a means of grace which forms part of the Church's order and system', but he objects strongly to any teaching which results in the 'disparagement' of baptism.

It would not be to my purpose here to argue the matter further and opinion doubtless will remain divided upon it. But the view of those who desire a return to the primitive doctrine has not only strong historical evidence in its favour but it does succeed in explaining why the traditional one, especially in face of the present-day pastoral difficulties, leaves us with so many unanswered questions. The majority of the Anglican clergy clearly do not wish for radical change in the prevailing practice; the custom of bringing infants to baptism, whatever the reasons may be, betokens a degree of good-will toward the Church which ought not to be lightly dissipated by reforms the meaning of which would fail to be generally understood. Moreover, as has been said, 'there is a great strength in an established and accepted practice, which cannot easily be compensated for by any changes, however desirable in themselves, for a long time to come'.²¹ I would maintain that our practice is sound on the whole, though in need of modification. What requires re-thinking is, I repeat, our *theology* of initiation, and we need in particular a realistic inquiry into the significance of *infant* baptism. Christian initiation in the New Testament and the early Church, with its pre-condition of personal faith and repentance, is represented in the modern world by baptism, confirmation, and first communion. The practice of paedobaptism cannot sustain the entire weight of the theological meaning which this regenerative process implies. It is also the present writer's belief that the Baptismal Office in the *Book of Common Prayer* will have to be revised and that much of the familiar phraseology should be discarded. The baptism of infants is a custom ubiquitous and immemorial; the baptism of such as are of riper years only a rare, and then usually undervalued, occasion. Yet adult baptism is the *norm*, and paedobaptism a departure therefrom. If I may be permitted to quote Dom Gregory Dix once more, 'the Church can very well afford infant Baptism, even as the practice in the vast majority of cases . . . *provided that it is never allowed to be thought of as normal*, that it is regarded always as an abnormality, wholly incomplete in itself and absolutely needing completion by the gift of the Spirit and the conscious response of faith for the full living of the Christian "eternal life" in time'.²²

Is this a 'low' view of baptism? I think not. It comprises the idea of 'new birth'—the baptized believer is thereby 'justified or accounted righteous—the forgiveness of sins, original and actual alike, and incorporation into Christ. The prevenient operation of the grace of God is recognized. But the sacrament without the Seal of the Spirit is lacking in an essential element, and the position of those who receive the one without, later, the other is theologically anomalous, though Anglicans would not wish to draw negative inferences concerning the spiritual status of those who reject both the episcopal ministry and the

²⁰ *Christian Initiation* (S.P.C.K., 1947).

²¹ Dix, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

²² *The Theology of Confirmation in Relation to Baptism*, p. 31 (italics his).

confirmation rite which the bishop alone (at least in the West) is empowered to administer.²³

But what has been said (one is bound to remark) is relevant to discussion on reunion. If confirmation is the 'seal' of baptism, a vital stage in the process of the Christian soul's entry into the inheritance of God's Kingdom, we cannot—I write as an Anglican—continue to regard it only as a bestowal of grace *ad robur*, desirable doubtless, yet strictly speaking quite unnecessary; nor shall we be able to speak of it in a rather apologetic and minimizing way—for there are some who do—merely as a peculiarity of Anglican discipline which non-Anglicans may be expected to disregard. It is to be hoped that the Church of South India will in course of time come to adopt it as the obligatory 'form of admission to full membership or communicant status'. I am aware that this insistence on the place of confirmation in the Christian life, though in accord with patristic teaching, is regarded by many as novel. One is reminded that in the middle ages confirmation was administered only in a most haphazard way; that the Church of Rome does not regard it as the prerequisite for admission to holy communion; and that its history can show no uniformity of usage: at times chrism, at times the imposition of hands, has been the custom; and, again, that the minister is not always the Bishop, since in the Eastern Church it is given by the priest. The prevailing Anglican doctrine is in fact well-enough summarized by the late Canon O. C. Quick, who says that confirmation 'confers graces of the Spirit, especially for growth and stability in the Christian life, and for boldness to confess Christ and "fight manfully under His banner", but nothing other in kind or in essential principle from what Baptism has already given'.²⁴ Yet it is the contention of the Anglican divines whose opinions I have indicated that the tradition of the West in this whole matter has diverged from the ancient and true doctrine and that the fruits of that error are now, in the problems created by 'nominal Christianity' in a secularized society, only too manifest. The Church has had before now, in order to recover soundness, to go back to 'the beginnings'. It may be that, as affecting the terms of admission to her sacred membership, she will have to do so once again.

B. M. G. REARDON

²³ The Bishop of Oxford has stated his view of the matter in the plainest terms. 'The traditional doctrine', he writes, 'of the relation of confirmation to baptism . . . assigned to baptism the "effect" of remission of sins, and to confirmation that of the gift of the Spirit. Since, however it would be absurd to describe anyone who has not received the gift of the Spirit as a member of the Church, it follows that . . . Confirmation, rather than baptism, admits to the Church. And to this there is an obvious disciplinary corollary. If the holy communion is the domestic sacrificial feast of the redeemed community which is the Church, no one who is not confirmed may be admitted to the holy communion' (*Oxford Diocesan Magazine*, December 1944, p. 111).

²⁴ *The Christian Sacraments*, p. 182.

THE PLACE OF JAMES THOMSON IN THE POETRY OF NATURE

TO MOST people the name of James Thomson means, if anything at all, *The Seasons*; to a select few, *The Castle of Indolence* also. The last two generations have been unkind to him. Most of those ornately bound volumes of his poems which graced many a Victorian drawing-room table have either migrated to the second-hand bookshops or ascended to the attics, there to join those family relics whose preservation sentiment demands. Probably numbers of them came to an untimely end during the recent paper salvage campaign and died gloriously, helping to win the war.

Yet Thomson wrote verses that are familiar to every man, woman, and child in the Empire—'Rule Britannia'—which few people associate with him or, indeed, with anyone else. He is one of those 'Oxford Poets' to whose select company they alone are admitted whose brows are worthily laurelled. Further, every writer on English literature in general assigns him an important and significant place in the development of our national poetry. Wordsworth, for example, in the *Essay* supplementary to the *Preface*, dwells upon his work and genius at considerable length and with warm appreciation, the only earlier names to which he makes more than a passing reference being Shakespeare, Milton, and Alexander Pope. It is, then, in the pleasing confidence that he is a poet to be reckoned with, that we take up one of the old volumes and proceed to explore the secret of its dispassionate immortality.

There is little in the personal history of James Thomson to detain us. He was born in the south of Scotland at the turn of the century, on 11th September 1700. He received the schooling and university training usual to youths of his station and country, and with the ministry of the Scottish Church in view. But his ambitions lay elsewhere, and with a partially completed poem on *Winter* in his pocket he left home for London, to try his fortune in the literary world, unaware that he was saying farewell to the land of his birth. In London poverty was his early lot, and he engaged in tutorial work until his published poetry brought him a measure of fame and some influential friends, but he never became a rich man. He died at Richmond, Surrey, on 27th August 1748, and was buried in the parish church there. By unquestionable right he has his memorial in Poet's Corner.

The treatment of Nature in English Poetry falls into three broad divisions. Poets before Thomson's day express a general delight in the genial aspects of Nature without being minutely descriptive. They are gleefully responsive to her warmth and colour, her lights and shades, her scents and music. We need only recollect Shakespeare's songs, so many of which vibrate to the loveliness of the world. Their joy is mainly a carefree revelling in the general beauty and glow of things; the joy of one who loves to lie under the greenwood tree

*and tune his merry note
unto the sweet bird's throat.*

Readers soon observe that in most of this poetry Natural Beauty is used as a

foil to the kindred or superior beauty of some fair lady who has won the poet's warm-hearted, if impermanent, admiration. Occasionally his fancy soared to more extravagant heights, and he credited her with actually imparting to the natural scene such beauty as it possessed. Doubtless the lady in each case was flattered, but hyperbole of this kind soon wears thin and becomes wearisome, and intelligible meaning tends to disappear. What, e.g. did Marlowe mean exactly, when he made Faustus say to Helen:

*O thou art fairer than the evening air,
Clad in the beauty of a thousand stars?*

It is 'grandiloquent' writing: the kind of thing that Marlowe could do to perfection and that makes him so easy and, we must admit, so delightful to read; but nevertheless it borders on nonsense, for there can be no true comparison of entirely disparate objects. One cannot, for example, compare a codfish with a Beethoven Sonata—unless one has the sense-organs that some modern poets appear to have developed. Perhaps Marlowe was trying to say what Wordsworth was one day to say to perfection:

*The stars of midnight shall be dear
To her; and she shall lean her ear
In many a secret place
Where rivulets dance their wayward round,
And beauty born of murmuring sound
Shall pass into her face.¹*

That is not 'grandiloquence', but something far superior; no musical, meaningless blast from a silver trumpet, but word music which moves us by its exquisite loveliness and the delicate truth which it expresses. Two centuries, at least, were to pass before poets could write like that, and even then the power was only granted to the chosen few. Thomson could not do it, but he helped to prepare the way for those who one day would.

The poets of that early period did not pay very close attention to Nature: their work is impressionistic and lacking in *insight*. They surrendered to sense impressions and *saw*, but only superficially. Clouds were clouds; fields were fields; hills were hills; yellow primroses were yellow primroses—though not the devitalized creations that Peter Bell saw. Those natural objects whose beauty they perceived inspired lyrics which men will say and sing so long as the loveliness of our English tongue endures: such as Shakespeare's

*Hark! hark! the lark at heaven's gate sings,
And Phebus 'gins arise,
His steeds to water at those springs
On chaliced flowers that lies;
And winking Mary-buds begin
To ope their golden eyes:
With every thing that pretty is,
My lady sweet, arise:
Arise, arise!²*

¹ *Three Years She Grew.*

² *Cymbeline*, ii.3.

156 PLACE OF JAMES THOMSON IN POETRY OF NATURE

As the seventeenth century passed its meridian the note of spontaneous gladness in the lavish beauty of the world grew fainter. Early in the new century Alexander Pope became the acknowledged arbiter of poetical taste and a certain hard 'brilliance' superseded the old, artless sweetness, light and joy. Nature was most to be admired when schooled into the geometrical decorum of Pope's famous garden at Twickenham, with its sculptured shrubs and trees, its grotto and its make-believe ruins. The new style could only be ephemeral and it was Thomson who raised the standard of revolt when his poem *Winter* made its unostentatious appearance in the London bookshops.

Those who have examined Meissonier's charming little pictures under a magnifying glass have been surprised and delighted at the unsuspected beauties revealed. In a similar manner Thomson approached the natural world. Such questions as the Almighty put to His servant Job, Thomson put to himself:

*Hast thou entered the treasures of the snow,
Or hast thou seen the treasures of the hail?³*

Hast thou seen and entered into the treasures of those natural objects whose beauties men have sung from time immemorial? So to do, and to help others to see what he saw, became the prime purpose of his life. His poems, and particularly *The Seasons*, became a kind of magnifying glass to those who read them. If men are to *see into* things, they must first *see*, and Thomson gave them that *sight* of Nature which precedes *insight*. Hitherto they had seen, in the main, superficially; now they saw in detail, and familiar, commonplace things took on a new, filigreed beauty, unperceived before. Dr. Samuel Johnson must have expressed the thoughts of many a contemporary when he wrote: 'The reader of *The Seasons* wonders that he never saw before what Thomson shows him, and that he never yet has felt what Thomson impresses.'⁴ Wordsworth was of the same opinion when he wrote of those who were 'somewhat mortified to find their notions disturbed by the appearance of a poet who seemed to owe nothing but to Nature and his own genius'. But, in a 'short time, the applause became unanimous: everyone wondering how so many pictures, and pictures so familiar, should have moved them but faintly to what they felt in his descriptions'.⁵

So Thomson inaugurated what we will regard as the second period of Nature Poetry. It will suffice if we confine our attention to *The Seasons*, his chief title to immortality. There are four poems, averaging 1,380 lines each of blank verse, written in heroic metre, and the peculiar characteristics of each season are subjected to close scrutiny, *for their own sakes alone and the wondering pleasure which their contemplation brings*. Thomson walks the world and takes us with him, and what he reveals enhances the dignity and value of him who beholds it:

*Man superior walks
Amid the glad creation, musing praise,
And looking lively gratitude.⁶*

The poems abound in little vignettes whose value lies, not in any moral

³ Job 38²² (R.V.).

⁴ 'Life of Thomson' in *Lives of the Poets*.

⁵ Essay supplementary to the Preface.

⁶ *Spring*, line 170.

teaching, but in their revelation of the beauty of the commonplace. Thomson invites us to listen to and observe the behaviour of birds, as they

in courtship to their mates
 Pour forth their little souls. First, wide around,
 With distant awe, in airy rings they rove,
 Endeavouring by a thousand tricks to catch
 The cunning, conscious, half-averted glance
 Of their regardless charmer. Should she seem,
 Softening, the least approbance to bestow,
 Their colours burnish, and, by hope inspired,
 They brisk advance; then, on a sudden struck,
 Retire disordered; then again approach;
 In fond rotation spread the spotted wing,
 And shiver every feather with desire.⁷

Only a man who had watched closely and lovingly could have written that, and particularly the last perfect line; but this is only a part of his picture. It must have been an entrancing revelation to most of his readers, whose world henceforward would be peopled and beautified by such birds as they had never seen before.

In his company we mark the gathering dusk of a summer's evening:

Sober evening takes
 Her wonted station in the middle air:
 A thousand shadows at her beck. First this
 She sends on earth: then that of deeper dye
 Steals soft behind: and then a deeper still,
 In circle following circle, gathers round,
 To close the face of things . . . ;⁸

or we watch with him the mists of Autumn and note how
 roll the doubling fogs around the hill.
 No more the mountain . . .

. . . fills the view
 With great variety; but in a night
 Of gathering vapour, from the baffled sense
 Sinks dark and dreary. Thence expanding far,
 The huge dusk, gradual, swallows up the plain:
 Vanish the woods: the dim-seen river seems
 Sullen, and slow, to roll the misty wave.
 Even in the height of noon oppressed, the sun
 Sheds, weak and blunt, his wide-refracted ray;
 . . . Indistinct on earth,
 Seen through the turbid air, beyond the life,
 Objects appear; and, wildered, o'er the waste
 The shepherd stalks gigantic; till at last
 Wreathed dun around, in deeper circles still
 Successive closing, sits the general fog
 Unbounded o'er the world; and, mingling thick,
 A formless grey confusion covers all.⁹

⁷ *ibid.*, l. 619.

⁸ *Summer*, l. 648.

⁹ *Autumn*, l. 710.

158 PLACE OF JAMES THOMSON IN POETRY OF NATURE

That is a piece of almost faultless reconstruction. There is not a word that acts below its reputation. To such earlier poets as considered it at all, a misty day had been just—a misty day: as it was to Chaucer:

*For I have seyn, of a ful misty morwe,
Folwen ful ofte a mery someres day.*¹⁰

A fog had been—just 'fog and filthy air', as it was to Macbeth's witches; something unpleasantly incidental to the main theme. But Thomson makes of the mist and fog a perfect little picture and we feel the clutching mystery and swaying, sinister beauty of it all.

Thus picture follows picture—Cattle by a stream; wild, living things; bees; sunset; moonlight; storms. Thomson is our guide, but he is not a talkative guide; he does not chatter about his ideas or force his interpretations upon us. He shows us each picture and leaves us to do the rest. Perhaps he would have agreed with Thoreau: 'We shall see but little if we require to understand what we see. How few things can a man measure with the tape of his understanding!' *Thomson raised men's expectations*, so that when next they walked abroad they saw what they had never seen before and it became a part of themselves.

W. LAMPLOUGH DOUGHTY

¹⁰ *Troilus and Criseyde*, iii. 1060.

(To be continued)
— p 249

THE OXYRHYNCHUS SAYINGS OF JESUS

Observation as to Source

IN A FORMER edition of the *Journal of Biblical Literature*¹ the present writer offered the suggestion that the Oxyrhynchus Logia (papyri 1, 654) demonstrated a pattern of development which might plausibly be associated with an homiletic *genre* of expression. There seemed several reasons why this was probably so. Certainly the dramatic quality of these excerpts may be easily conceded. To be sure, this feature has been elsewhere adduced, quite apart from the present homiletic hypothesis, to connect the collection with other extant fragments.² On the other hand, the derivative tone of these sayings has been noted by investigators from the very first. Among other possible sources, our canonical gospels have been consistently detected to be basic to the Oxyrhynchus compilation. It has seemed safe to infer upon further consideration, therefore, that we have to do with an expansion of

¹ Vol. LXV (June 1946), pp. 175–83: the article, 'The Oxyrhynchus Sayings of Jesus', has been drawn upon in several of its more important conclusions in the development of the present discussion.

² H. G. Evelyn White's edition of the Oxyrhynchus Logia is here used as the basic text. In his careful Introduction, Evelyn White argues definite literary relationship between the *Gospel According to the Hebrews* and the Logia by reason of their commonly 'striking and dramatic' traits.

essentially evangelic material with what seems best identified as sermonic intent. Again, the doctrinally neutral character of these dicta appears reasonably evident—a feature which has also received significantly uniform recognition by scholars. Hence visible departures from the limits of canonical expression seem accounted for with least difficulty on the ground of deliberate, homiletic elaboration, within which hortatory and didactic framework the striking and dramatic, so consistently present in these fragments, is the normal concomitant.

The disposition to see in any of the Oxyrhynchus sayings possibly 'an earlier and more original version' than its canonical counterpart³ thus appears less probable by way of explanation of their unique character than the application of the principle here suggested. Also, on this consideration, wherever canonical basis can be reasonably asserted, there may be observed the attempt, not to quote slavishly our four gospels, but to weave freely their phrases and spirit into an original fabric, with the probable aim of embodying the authority of their suggestion rather than capturing the accuracy of their form.

To be sure, modern scholarship in some of its most responsible pronouncements has made out credible cases for provenance in the suggestion of one or another of the extant apocryphal gospels. The discoverers' choice of the *Gospel According to the Egyptians*⁴ and Harnack's more elaborate arguments for the same source⁵ need simply be mentioned. As already intimated, Evelyn White has demonstrated preference for the *Gospel According to the Hebrews* as the probable matrix for our present materials.⁶ Or the attempt has been made, as by Charles Taylor,⁷ to set forth a number of possible sources. He, too, however, sees in the *Gospel According to the Egyptians* the most probable context from which these fragments might have been appropriated. It should nevertheless be noted that, even in terms of treatment of this latter sort, canonical sayings are felt to be fundamental to the logographer's elaboration.⁸

As to the character of the Logia, we might well here re-emphasize what Grenfell and Hunt realized from the beginning. Initial and later observations concur in judging these fragments to be conspicuously devoid of tendency. This fact is patently in contrast to the 'clear manifestations of a Jewish-Christian spirit' attaching to the *Gospel According to the Hebrews*; nor do the few Encratite fragments from the *Gospel According to the Egyptians*, alongside of the Oxyrhynchus collection, argue more harmonious rapport. To be sure, Saying I, duplicated almost *verbatim* in the Hebrew gospel, gives sober pause. The coincidence, however, does not seem unequivocally to sustain the conclusion of literary identity for the two sources in view of the equally urgent alternatives by which such similarity might be explained. For example, a suggestion of the same *seriatim* arrangement of ideas in II Clement (v. 5)

³ So Evelyn White with reference to Saying VI.

⁴ Grenfell and Hunt, *Sayings of Our Lord* (London 1897).

⁵ *Über die jüngst entdeckten Sprüche Jesu* (Leipzig und Tübingen 1897).

⁶ *The Sayings of Jesus from Oxyrhynchus* (Cambridge (England) 1920).

⁷ *The Oxyrhynchus Logia and the Apocryphal Gospels* (London 1899).

⁸ Kirsopp Lake ('The New Sayings of Jesus', *Hibbert Journal*, Vol. III (1905), pp. 332ff.) opposes the opinion of W. Sanday that the development of the Logia parallels that of our canonical gospels. Dr. Lake nonetheless does feel that these sayings illustrate the growth of gospel tradition with its two-fold and, as often, independent interest in 'sayings' and 'doings'.

as is common to the Hebrew gospel and the Logia⁹ points to the possibility of an identical source, or to similar sources, for all three documents. Certainly, the Syriac rendering of the *Acts of Thomas* (And when he hath found rest he becometh a king),¹⁰ in addition to various New Testament treatments of the apocalyptic themes 'resting' and 'reigning', indicates a familiar currency of these ideas in early Christianity, either singly or in the combinations presented above. In any case, identification of Logia and Hebrew gospel need not necessarily turn about their mutual possession of the saying under discussion.

If, on the other hand, it can be established that in the Oxyrhynchus Logia we have to do with a set of pregnant sayings of Jesus which have been homiletically elaborated, interest would seem to attach anew to what has been early observed to be a probable point of correspondence between our present fragments and certain areas of the *Corpus Hermeticum*. It will be noted that Saying VIII and *Corp.* VII (1, 2) reveal a striking similarity in sentiment. Associating 'blindness' and 'ignorance', they imply 'drunkenness' to be basic to both. It is at once obvious, nevertheless, how guarded any conclusion must be which might follow from such agreement. Yet, the juxtaposition of 'blindness' and 'ignorance' is at least an interesting point of contact between the two writings. And, indeed, Eusebius's similar quotation in his *Adversus Hieroclem*¹¹ points to the availability and the appeal of this Hermetic sentiment, or its sources, to Christian protagonists. What does seem to the writer significant, however, is the unmistakably homiletic tone and pattern of Hermetic and Oxyrhynchus excerpts at this juncture—a tone and pattern here felt to be easily demonstrable throughout the Oxyrhynchus collection as thus far recovered.

Of the spirit of this particular 'sermonette' Dibelius remarks significantly:¹²

Such a combination of self recommendation and of the preaching of conversion is the typical mark of the divine or semi-divine herald of a revelation in Hellenistic religiousness, i.e. of a mythological person. In these ways speak sons of God and supermen who promise the world the only true salvation. . . . In the churches . . . the person of Jesus was looked upon in the light of this redemption faith.

Whether, to be sure, λέγει 'Ἰησοῦς can be supported as the guarantee for the solemn pronouncement of an Hellenistic 'superman' in Christian guise need not be pressed. On the other hand, it does seem defensible to assert that the hortatory impression appears similarly persistent upon both Oxyrhynchus and Hermetic details. Indeed, Hermes says:

. . . I made myself a guide to mankind, teaching them the doctrine, how in what wise they might be saved. And I sowed in them the teachings of wisdom; and that which I sowed was watered with the water of immortal life. . . .¹³

⁹ Saying I and corresponding Hebrew fragment present the identical sequence 'seeking', 'finding', 'amazement', 'reigning', 'rest'; II Clement approximates this order with the notion of 'wonder' (θαυμάσιον), of 'resting', and the suggestion of 'reigning' (βασιλεία).

¹⁰ W. Wright, *Apocryphal Acts* (London 1871), p. 270.

¹¹ Loeb series, *Philostratus*, Vol. II, *Adv. Hiero.*, Chap. 42 (trans. F. C. Conybeare).

¹² *From Tradition to Gospel* (New York 1835), pp. 281 ff.

¹³ *Corpus Hermeticum*, I.29 (Walter Scott, *Hermetica* (Oxford 1924), Vol. I). The writer regrets that Professor, A. D. Nock's edition of the *Hermetica* was not also available at the time of this writing.

Nor can it be seriously questioned that, methodologically, the authority of Jesus has in the Logia been likewise enlisted to some such end.

Surely, there is here no effort to identify the Sayings of Jesus with the theosophical-philosophical literature of Hermes. This writer is nevertheless tempted to conjecture an acquaintance on the part of the Christian logographer with the Hermetic writings. Such a possible acquaintance may thus be reflected in his studied use and hortatory elaboration of essentially evangelic sources, countering consciously the esoteric pronouncements of Hermes with the 'life-giving' sayings of Jesus.

LEON EDW. WRIGHT

Notes and Discussions

EDUCATION: A 'HIGH WORD' OR A 'BYWORD'?

Some Personal Impressions

EVERYBODY believes in Education; our rulers are agreed that we cannot afford an ignorant democracy; but the strange thing is that very few seem to know what it really is. What is Education? I daresay some clever person might make the retort: 'What *isn't*?' and leave it at that. Seriously, I suggest that in every University there ought to be a special course of lectures on 'What it's all about'. An old friend of mine, the Head Master of a well-known Grammar School said, in a talk we had on the subject: 'It's high time we had another Government Commission on Education. We don't really know what we are supposed to be aiming at. Here we are, working the great machine, preparing boys for the regulation exams, one stage after another, but we are not at all clear as to the real meaning of Education.'

In what follows I am trying to set down a few personal impressions and reflections. Not that I claim to be an expert or specialist, but an ordinary circuit minister who has had the privilege of various contacts with the educational world. I have taught boys in this country and in China, have had some years' experience of Elementary and Public School (also Borstal), in addition to some University teaching and examining.

John Henry Newman, whose polished limpid prose is always a joy to read, remarks in those famous Lectures on 'The Scope and Nature of University Education' that the word Education is a 'high word'. It is indeed, but may it not also become a 'byword', a snare and a delusion? William Blake, in his vehement way, protested, 'Education is the great evil', but we remember that he was a self-educated madman of genius. Much the same has been said by some earnest Methodists about their ministers: 'College learning only spoils a preacher.' Stuffing the head and starving the heart; the danger is ever present and there is truth in the saying: No fool like the academic fool. Confucius in his far-off day said: 'The superior man (the man of education?) is not a receptacle'—to hold a certain quantity of knowledge. Real Education always means, in Plato's great phrase, 'Turning the eye of the soul toward the light'.

Elementary Education has made remarkable progress since about the turn of the century; its main purpose had been to banish illiteracy, make the Three

R's the foundation, with a certain amount of useful knowledge, thus giving a smattering of culture. We have outgrown the idea that the great thing was to be able to join the black-coat army and rise in the social scale above the mere manual worker. In the Introduction to the *Code* of 1904-26 still quoted in the latest *Handbook of Suggestions for Teachers*, I notice these striking words: 'The purpose of the Public Elementary School is to form and strengthen the character and to develop the intelligence of the children entrusted to it, and to make the best use of the school years available in assisting them, according to their different needs, to fit themselves, practically as well as intellectually, for the work of life.' To make that a fully Christian statement, one might expand it thus: '... the full development of each individual, body, mind, and character, according to God's holy purposes of redeeming Love as we learn to spell them out in Jesus Christ.' That is also the answer to the implied challenge in 'You can't make a silk purse out of a sow's ear'. The dark forces of heredity and environment are mysterious and powerful, but can we set any limits to the working of Divine grace?

To quote J. H. Newman again, we must recognize clearly 'the wisdom that comes of sound learning as against the knowledge which can be taken into the market'. It is the old trouble, Education for *living*, or for *a living*? The teacher is not an educational huckster, a purveyor of useful knowledge. In our Public Schools (so called) there is the same trouble, and others as well. When I went down from Cambridge to join the staff of a fairly well-known Public School, old-fashioned notions still held sway; rather like that eighteenth-century notion expressed by Dr. Johnson, who condemned all 'bypaths' in schooling. Education, he maintained, was a very simple matter; its method and outline had long been known. (Later on I thought of that when in 1913 I was taken to see the ruined examination cells in Canton; the candidates for Imperial honours used to be locked in and set to write out all they knew, more or less, on the basis of the Chinese Classics. It is said that even when one of them died during the ordeal, the body was merely removed through the window!) As for the University Diploma in Education, the Head (a great character) knew nothing about such new-fangled things. It would have been much more to the point if I could have told him I had gained a 'Blue'. However, if Education means all-round discipline, training of character, we did do some good. Public School Education in the old days must have been stranger still; I remember the celebrated Oscar Browning, the 'O.B.', at Cambridge, telling us that when he was a housemaster at Eton, nearly a hundred years ago, the teaching was incredibly bad. Every Saint's Day was a whole holiday and the eve a half holiday. The only Science teaching was when he invited Professor T. H. Huxley one day to come and give a talk to the boys of his House! On the other hand I noticed that in a recent debate in the House of Lords on the quality of Civil Service candidates, there was severe criticism of the products of our State Secondary schools as compared with Public Schools; they 'lacked guts', personality; they were often merely 'trained examinees'.

As for our Universities, one thing seems plain in this strange new world, there is a serious problem now facing them. Quite simply, it is this: What is a University meant to do? What is it all about? There is urgent need of a philosophical, comprehensive view! 'You must be above your knowledge.' Sir C.

Grant Robertson asks among other questions not yet settled: 'Of what is, or ought, a degree to be a test? In what sense may an examinee, who has never been under a Teacher of the University, regard himself, if he passes the examination of the University, as having also had a University Education.' J. H. Newman writes: 'If I had to choose between a so-called University which dispensed with residence and tutorial superintendence, and gave its degrees to any person who passed an examination in a wide range of subjects, and a University which had no professors or examinations at all, but merely brought a number of young men together for three or four years, and then sent them away, as the University of Oxford is said to have done some sixty years since, if I were asked which of these two methods was the better discipline of the intellect . . . I have no hesitation in giving the preference to that University which did nothing, over that which exacted of its members an acquaintance with every science under the sun. . . .' He explains the seeming paradox by referring to results as the test, the influence of the Public Schools and colleges of England during the previous century. And this, too, in the light of G. M. Trevelyan's remark in his charming little book on Trinity College: 'So passes away the easy-going eighteenth century with a sound of the drawing of corks!' But the ideal is plain; education should mean membership in a society, not merely acquiring knowledge, but a life; working together, playing together, praying together, with exams: a test of character as well as of capacity to absorb a mass of facts; in short, what Newman means by Liberal Education, the education of a gentleman. Here is the open secret of Oxford and Cambridge, their power and charm, essentially the same since the thirteenth century. The Classical Humanist tradition was supposed to produce the highest culture, training the intellect for its own sake; nothing to do with utility, and yet that *was* its use. As one writer puts it, the ideal is the kind of man who can speak good sense in English in ordinary conversation, who has sound judgement in life, can seize the strong point in any subject he may choose to grapple with. An incident in my China days provides a comment on this; if I remember rightly, one of the great Trading Companies of the Far East applied to the Appointments Board at Cambridge asking them to send more of their men, 'Classics preferred'.

When I went up to Trinity in the good old days before the two shattering wars, this philosophical, humanist tradition was already beginning to fade. It was now to be the turn of Science with a vengeance! Like Bottom the weaver, Science said, 'Let me play the lion's part'; in fact it threatened to take charge of the whole drama. Grant Robertson writes of 'the increasing danger of breeding a really illiterate and de-humanized race of specialized scientists who know and care nothing for anything outside the scanty plot that they have assiduously tilled'. The greater part of the enormous Government grant to our Universities today no doubt goes to provide the immense and costly equipment required for scientific research (hardly for the teaching of Literature, History, and Philosophy). It is lamentable to find so many budding scientists in our day who can tell you all about aero engines, chemical formulae, and what not, yet scarcely able to write good grammatical English, much less appreciate the beauties of poetry or the reality of spiritual values. We honour the devoted disinterested work of the best men of Science, but anyone who is deeply concerned about true Education cannot help feeling some misgiving.

Sir Richard Livingstone, in his wise little books on Education recalls Plato's simple profound words: 'The noblest of all studies is the study of what man is and of what life he should live.' That leads straight to Religion; all true Education must be religious; that is really 'what it is all about'. Science gives truth, but not the whole truth, only one aspect. Again, Liberal Education, the highest training of the intellect for its own sake, is excellent; its root meaning is that a man should be *free*, not *servile*; but it is not complete in itself. There is all the difference in the world between an educated pagan and a Christian Humanist, between the sin of the intellect, 'the lust of the head', and true humility. A. N. Whitehead's famous saying, that there can be no moral training without the habitual vision of greatness, goes far to explain our present successes and failures. The true Christian might go farther still and claim that the truth of Revealed Religion is a condition of all knowledge, of all morality, of all art. We may teach anything and everything—our Universities may have to follow the example of Birmingham and include a Faculty of Commerce—but one thing can never be ignored, and that is Theology, '*Divina mater scientiarum*'. Blot out that, and you 'take the spring out of the year'. Education, instead of remaining a 'high word', might easily become a 'byword'.

CHARLES GIMBLETT

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

APERSISTENT heresy of modern times is the theory that all education is formal and that the schools of the country must assume the total responsibility for the full development of individuals. It is true that a school must contain in symbolic form all that constitutes a community, but the dynamic equilibrium or integration that is desiderated in individual citizens can only be established and maintained through the widening of the processes of organic planning and development in every part of the body politic. 'The city educates the man', and it is our contention that when conflicts and irrationalities obtain in the community it is hopeless to expect harmony and integration in the lives of individuals. 'The State is the individual writ-large', as Plato contended, but the converse is equally true and significant. Christian education as a policy demands that the whole community be trained to think in Christian terms and categories. There can be no distinction between our public and private worlds. That way lies stultification and paralysis.

There is a remarkable unanimity of consent among competent observers that the present world crisis is a crisis of values. The disintegrating forces of the modern situation have fallen with devastating power on the rising generation at the most susceptible stage in its development. The dominant issue of the present seems to lie in the decision between a spiritual or a material interpretation of the universe. Economic factors play a distracting part, but the anxiety, insecurity, the ennui, the restlessness and dark loneliness of modern man is due to an underlying uncertainty concerning any absolute or eternal significance to human life. It engenders a blindness or indifference to the abiding meaning and destiny of the human soul. The logical result of this scepticism is what Dr. Fosdick has rightly called a 'futilitarian' way of living

exemplified only too often in the phrase: 'What is the use anyhow?' Terrestrial optimism cannot be based on cosmic pessimism.

None but the most obtuse can be unaware of the present tendencies, involving the forcible extermination of the very principles and beliefs upon which, in the rather excessively optimistic days between the two great wars, a co-operative world had been ideally shaping itself. The origin and contributory causes of this impasse of civilization have been duly analysed. More profitable is to ask: 'By what changes in our beliefs, purposes, activities, can we stay or crush the processes of disintegration and establish the conditions that will favour continued life and growth in society?' Briefly, how shall we start our Western culture on a fresh cycle of development? Can we recover new faith in life, a fresh unity, a restored confidence of the soul?—so that we shall have that strength of character and purpose that will enable us to use rather than be crushed by the forces of circumstances and the apparent intractability of our present environment. Where are we to find our source of unity, a really effective synthesis out of the modern chaos?

There is no doubt that under the impact of the industrial revolution and the mass movements resulting from it, the moral, spiritual, and cultural unity of Europe has been shattered in pieces. Apart from the intellectual, the moral disunity is a sign of vacuity and bankruptcy. This loss of unity is our greatest modern predicament. There are fortunately not lacking those who have some perception of these disastrous tendencies. To recover an integrating idea, to give a sense of meaning and aspiration to life is a problem with various suggested solutions: in science by the devotees of positive method and technical advance; in politics by the new totalitarian movements of collectivism; in philosophy by those who still yearn for the restoration of scholasticism; and in religion by those who look to religious education as a social cement. But in the last resort, the issue, as we have already indicated, is a religious issue, that is, an issue concerning the nature of man and his place and station in the world. The really effective sphere of synthesis is religion. All education is a spiritual undertaking, for if knowledge and institutions are to have a moral end, to subserve the highest interests of man, the synthesizing of knowledge must be in relation to that moral end. 'The relief of man's estate' depends on a clear educational aim—'to glorify God and enjoy Him for ever.' What is needed today is a living faith, capable of course of adjustment to increased knowledge and changing conditions, but preserving the permanent legacy of our Christian heritage. In our modern revolutionary period it is too often forgotten that the past contains springs yet unexhausted whence living water can be drawn. The chief source of spiritual nourishment for any nation must, after all, be its own past perpetually rediscovered, revaluated, and renewed. There is no necessity to choose between revolution and reaction. The emphasis in the past on the Sovereignty of God is a custom that can never grow stale or demoded. Never perhaps has it been more essential to stress the supremacy of reason and conscience than in these days of depressed values and corroded ideals. Our main problem is to re-state perennial truths in terms which would be clearly understood and warmly accepted by the modern world.

'The good news' flourished in an age as dark as our own because it gave a theoretical and practical answer to the riddle that life posed. Has not the

Church lost both the realistic pessimism as well as the profound optimism which are contained in the answer of Christianity? The Gospel is a diagnosis of the human situation which is extremely grave. Christ cherished no illusions about the desperate condition of man, but the Gospel is designed to reach down to the depths of sin, to face the worst about humanity, but by the power of God able 'to save to the uttermost'. It is out of a fresh stirring of the spirit, a profounder insight into the full significance of the Gospel message, that effective religious education will arise. Paul's life is the pure exemplar by precept and action of the Christian principle of integration, which made him able to face with courage and serenity all that befell him. 'To live in Christ' made life worth living. That was the secret of

*The freer step, the fuller breath . . .
The life that maketh all things new!*

Modern education, on the contrary, is painfully allergic to the humanistic virus. Sir Richard Livingstone, whose works breathe the very quintessence of culture, quotes Whitehead with approval on the disastrous consequences of the weakening of the Stoic-Christian ideals.¹ How disappointing, however, is the answer to his own most pertinent query. 'In judging any individual or nation the most searching question that can be asked is: "Whom has he taken for master and how faithful is his service?"' The answer avoids the issue and by no means illumines: 'We might accept excellence as master.' Who can define excellence?—more to the point, excellence in what? It seems that a humanistic approach, however noble or thinly disguised, leads nowhere. Profounder insight and analysis is provided by Sir Fred Clarke in his answer to the problem of how can society cohere. 'By faith and love.' He admits that the terms look empty enough until they receive their proper content. 'No definition or social science or system of law can confer that content. It can be given only by life and the grace of God.'²

In times of great spiritual and intellectual confusion like the present we must not burke the larger issues, the answer to which can give meaning, coherence, system, and purpose to our philosophy of living. It is the business of education to interpret experience, but it vastly matters what the interpretation is. The confusion of primary and subordinate objectives is glaring in educational literature. The full development of personality, loosely defined, may be an aim spiritually and morally dangerous. The test is in the use and direction of personality. Training in the social virtues of good citizenship is laudable, but it encourages judgement of failure or success by purely human standards. There are no human foundations that can bear the weight of the educational fabric.

Purposes and aims, however, are hopelessly inadequate unless there is superadded the power of achievement. Herein lies the glory of the specific Christian synthesis, which correlates faith in the supreme destiny of man with the enabling grace of God to attain it. That is the full-orbed Christian conception of life. The perennial need of human culture is two-fold—the need of knowledge and the need of power, the combination of truth and grace. Both these are supplied uniquely in the self-revelation of God in Christ Jesus who was 'full of grace and truth'. Christian education wherever it is communicated,

¹ *Some Tasks for Education*, p. 31.

² *op. cit.* p. 47.

³ *Education and Social Change*, pp. 67-9.

in home, school, or church, succeeds in proportion to the fidelity with which it reveals Jesus as He was. The world is perishing for want of redemption, guidance, leadership. All the Gospel stories are power-patterns, variations on the central theme of the dominion of the Master of life. He strides through the evangelical records with the gait of a Colossus and in his career he storms the barricades of every form of evil and of fear. It is power all the way; it is victory over life and death.

The supreme task of Christian education is to pass on that one absolute fact, so visible in the days of His flesh and confirmed by the experience of generations who have drawn on the resources of the Risen Christ.

J. E. PARRY

Recent Literature

I Believe in . . ., by Norman Snaith. (S.C.M., 6s.)

Dr. Snaith has published an expanded and considerably strengthened version of a series of articles originally written for the *Methodist Recorder*. The volume is in the nature of a running commentary upon the Apostles' Creed, and it might well be called: 'What the Creed means to me.' The author has attempted, with a remarkable degree of success, the difficult task of writing colloquially. He rarely uses slang and is never vulgar. There is no doubt that his kind of teaching is greatly needed today. Throughout much of the book Dr. Snaith offers, sometimes in unconventional ways, familiar interpretations of words and clauses in the Creed. The most informative sections, as might be expected, are those in which deep knowledge of the Hebrew religion and language lights up Christian truth. Examples are the discussion of the Day of the Lord, the meaning of 'Spirit', and Paul's use of *hamartia* in 2 Corinthians 5²¹. Frequently a daring illustration justifies itself. In several places the writer has courageously wrestled with familiar theological problems, but he rightly hides the signs of mental struggle. I have been specially impressed, in this respect, by Dr. Snaith's treatment of the idea of *kenosis* (the term itself is not used), and of the conception of the omnipotence and 'unchangeableness' of God. There are at least two fresh attempts to help the beginner which deserve careful thought by those who seek to teach theology in simple language. One is the explanation of substitution in terms of absorption. (At least Dr. Snaith tries to be true to the fact of Substitution which is now usually ignored in thought about the Work of Christ.) The other is that the believer should distinguish in his mind 'the Spirit of God' and 'God the Holy Spirit'. I am inclined to think that, for the purpose he has in view, Dr. Snaith has here succeeded. There are, however, two chapters with which the present writer is in such serious disagreement that it would be unfair to attempt a criticism in these few lines. The chapters upon the Church and upon Baptism seem highly unsatisfactory. The author believes that the conceptions of the Church as the Body of Christ and as the People of God are 'ultimately incompatible', he regrets that we speak of 'the Methodist Church', and he views infant baptism as wholly an act of dedication and (p. 114) makes the extraordinary suggestion that such dedication 'makes it a Sacrament of the Church'. These chapters apart, I should like to express my admiration for a fine attempt to teach Christian doctrine in non-technical language.

FREDERIC GREEVES

Kierkegaard Studies, by T. H. Croxall. (Lutterworth Press, 15s.)

After a generation of close and enthusiastic study of Kierkegaard, it is still a matter of discussion whether he is one of the great philosophers of our age, or a voluminous but somewhat whimsical commentator on aspects of Christianity which he but partly understood. 'Existentialism', the name given to his system—if indeed he should be credited with one—is professed also by writers like Heidegger and Sartre, who approve of him as little as he would have approved of them! But most students of his fascinating works are agreed that from the first of them, which appeared just after the breaking off of his engagement to marry, till his death in the midst of a mortal struggle with the Established Church in Denmark, he lived first and wrote afterwards, though he wrote with his heart's blood. All his writing was autobiographical. His relations with his father, with the girl he had hoped to marry, with the ecclesiastics of Copenhagen, and with journalists, affected him profoundly, and sharpened the edge of the question which he was trying to answer in every one of his books, how—not just to 'believe', but—to act and live as a Christian. It has recently been suggested by Dr. Haecker (*Kierkegaard the Cripple*) that a distressing physical deformity intensified his 'existentialism' and acted like a continuous 'thorn in the flesh' on his sensitive nature. But can we not pay too much attention to these restless movements of his thought? Can we not also turn to him for simple guidance in Christian belief? Mr. T. H. Croxall thinks that we can. He has been for many years, he tells us, a close student of Kierkegaard; and the Master of Balliol, who has more recently discovered his magic, writes a commendatory and sympathetic foreword to his book. Mr. Croxall deprecates the study of Kierkegaard's crises. He wishes rather to relate his teaching to the Bible and to our own age. To do this he has arranged that teaching under the three headings of Man, Christianity, and God. The result is a collection of observations and discussions on Religion, illuminated by copious reference to Kierkegaard, but chosen in no chronological order, and not seldom failing to do justice to Kierkegaard's peculiar dialectic, or the steady though tortuous progress of his thought from stage to stage of his life's way. Nor does Mr. Croxall always make it easy to distinguish Kierkegaard's reflections from his own. In some instances, as notably in the section on music, Kierkegaard is left behind altogether. Unlike most of us, he has read his author in the original Danish, and on such elusive terms as *Gentagelse* and *Ueensartethed* we might reasonably have looked for more help. He rightly calls attention (to refer to individual points) to the prominence of paradox in Kierkegaard's interpretation of Christianity; but he allows the reader to miss the urgency that should assail him, for example, in *Fear and Trembling*, *The Concept of Dread*, and the long-drawn-out poignancy of *The Works of Love*. Again in his zeal to set forth Kierkegaard as the champion of orthodox Christianity Mr. Croxall does not stay to point out what he attacked in the orthodoxy of his day, and what he failed to see in the Scriptural presentation of the teaching of Christ. But we are promised further studies from the author; and meanwhile we may welcome the possibility that the book will introduce readers to whom Kierkegaard is little more than a name, to the actual writings of the Master, suggestive, challenging, and always rewarding.

WILLIAM F. LOFTHOUSE

The Biblical Doctrine of the Church, by William Robinson. (Berean Press, Birmingham, 12s. 6d.)

In the progress of the Ecumenical Movement much has been achieved by examination of the nature of the ministry and the Sacraments, but the demand is now for a clearer understanding of the nature of the Church. Dr. Robinson's book—which is marked by that exact scholarship which we have come to associate with him—is a distinctive contribution to this inquiry. In the first half of the book he examines the

New Testament teaching and shows that, whilst the concept of the Church as 'the Body of Christ' is typically Pauline, this is also entirely consistent with the teaching of other New Testament writers, and that for them all the Church is a rich, mystical reality at the centre of God's redemptive purpose for the world. This section of the book should be of great exegetical value to every serious preacher. In its latter half, Dr. Robinson deals with the Church as 'that concrete reality by which Christ becomes manifest to the world and by which he acts in history'. Upon this foundation his book has something to teach both Catholics and Protestants. Dr. Robinson examines the claim for apostolicity through episcopal succession—and does so in a completely irenic spirit—skilfully bringing out from recent writings of those who defend this view, their *own* testimony to the apostolic nature of the Church's Ministry. 'The Church and Ministry cannot be set apart in the way that the strict Catholic doctrine of apostolic succession demands.' In his closing chapters, Dr. Robinson traverses much the same path as does Professor T. W. Manson in *The Church's Ministry*, and his work may well stand with it as an answer to Dr. Kirk's *The Apostolic Ministry*. Dr. Robinson's aim is to help forward the work of understanding between Catholics and Protestants, which, in his view, is 'necessary to the emergence of that *una sancta* which in our day is most desirable, not only because the Lord wills it, but because that without it the world can hardly be saved from perishing'. This book is as stimulating as it is timely.

JOHN T. WILKINSON

The New Testament Doctrine of the 'Last Things': A Study of Eschatology, by H. A. Guy. (Oxford Press, 10s. 6d.)

The chief merit of this book is that it presents in clear and concise review the various eschatological data in the New Testament. It will render good service to both the teacher and the student who appreciate a convenient collection of all the material. The survey properly begins in Hebrew and Jewish eschatology and ends with the Johannine writings. The reader can therefore see at once the presentation of the thought in any particular section and its development in the whole. In a final chapter Mr. Guy assesses the value of the New Testament view of the 'last things'. How far can we and ought we to make use of its eschatological ideas and forms in offering the Gospel to the modern man? Do they provide an adequate 'plan' for the building of the new world? Here some fuller emphasis on the essential and abiding elements in the New Testament hope would have been welcome. We should demur at one or two points in the discussion. For example, has the saying in Luke 18^{8b} 'little or no connexion with the parable' of the Unrighteous Judge? If the dominant idea of the parable is *vindication* (cf. verses 3, 5), then the eschatological ending is not inappropriate in its setting and it takes its place among other Parousia sayings in St. Luke's Gospel (17²²⁻³⁰, etc.). The exposition, however, is competent throughout and the arrangement excellent. The section on the teaching of the Synoptic Gospels and the place of eschatology in the mind of Jesus is especially valuable. The balanced view which the author takes on 'realized eschatology' is also welcome. We are all eschatologists nowadays. Modern preaching may shirk eschatological themes; but this book is a further evidence of the deep interest they still hold in theological research. A few misprints appear (see pp. 32, 40, 59, 83, 124), and the latest *Commentary on 1 Peter* is not E. G. Selwyn's but F. W. Beare's.

H. G. MEECHAM

A Guide to the Gospels, by W. Graham Scroggie. (Pickering & Inglis, 25s.)

This voluminous work, well printed and produced, is in three parts. In the first the Gospels are viewed 'synthetically' and general matters of introduction are dealt with. In the second they are treated 'analytically', the distinctive features of each

Gospel being brought out. The third part is 'Christological', and includes the great events of our Lord's redemptive activity from His birth to His ascension and pre-millennial return. The book is designed for those who have no knowledge of Greek. There are a number of sketch-maps, bibliographies, and questions. All the Synoptics are dated in the decade A.D. 50-60; and all four Gospels are said to have been written by those whose names they bear. The internal evidence which is held to establish the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel is summarized from what Westcott wrote in 1880. But the author accepts the usual view that Luke and Matthew made use of Mark and 'Q'. One chapter contends (partly on account of Matthew 12⁴⁰) that Jesus was crucified on Wednesday and rose again on Saturday evening. This is one of the very few matters about which the writer affirms that 'the traditional view cannot be maintained'. While admiring Dr. Scroggie's industry, one cannot help feeling that the detailed classification and tabulation have been overdone. It is only occasionally that we find a paragraph of ordinary English prose; everything seems to turn to tables and statistics. For instance, on the fascinating subject of 'The method of Christ's teaching', we are given a series of lists, with sub-divisions and references. The first is on 'Imagery' and includes the following under sub-section (iii) a: 'Physical—Flesh and blood, the eye, ear, hands, feet; hunger, thirst, sleep, sickness, laughing, weeping, death.' On the other hand, more might have been said on the historical background. It is explained how the Romans came to appoint Herod the Great, but the reader is left in the dark as to how and when the transition to procurators came about. In the case of St. John's Gospel nothing is said about possible displacements, and the discussion of its relation to the Synoptics passes too lightly over some of the difficulties. In a work of nearly seven hundred pages, one would have welcomed more than a sentence on Form Criticism. Some matters of importance are treated sketchily or omitted, and others of doubtful value are dealt with in minute detail. There are a few slips in matters of fact. Thus the 'talent' is described as a coin. Another monetary word, *chalkos*, 'brass', is said to be peculiar to Matthew, but this word occurs twice in Mark (6³, 12⁴¹) and only once in Matthew. On p. 378 we read that 'Luke alone, in the story of Jairus's daughter, says that Jesus "commanded that something be given her to eat"', revealing a physician's interest in a little child's welfare; but the words occur also in Mark 5⁴³.

T. FRANCIS GLASSON

The Pastoral Epistles, by Burton Scott Easton. (S.C.M., 10s. 6d.)

Students of the New Testament, who are indebted to Professor Easton for his commentary on *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, and for his studies on Form Criticism, will welcome another commentary from his pen. In this volume Dr. Easton has given his own translation set out in paragraphs and interspersed with commentary, with a simple exposition, and then a fuller discussion of points of text and interpretation. There is an introduction, and an appendix on Word Studies. The Epistles are printed in the order in which, as Easton and many others believe, they were written—2 Timothy, Titus, 1 Timothy. The reasons for accepting this order are explained in the concise introduction, in which are also set out lucidly the purpose of the Epistles and their place in the history of early Christianity. The question of their relation to Paul is frankly discussed, and the difficulties of attributing them, as they stand, to the Apostle are adequately presented. Not only is it almost impossible to fit them in to what we know of Paul's life, but also the accumulation of differences between these and the undoubted letters of Paul—differences of style, vocabulary, theological outlook, date, Church polity—have led the majority of scholars to ascribe them to a disciple of Paul, a generation after the Apostle's death. In Dr. Easton's view the author was a 'Pastor' who owed much to Paul, and summarized here the lessons which

he drew from Paul's Epistles. The first readers doubtless knew who he was, and did not regard his pseudonymity or use of authentic material (written or oral) as anything but commendable. The success of his first letter, which we call 2 *Timothy*, led him to 'deal more directly with contemporary difficulties' in another, which he chose to address to Timothy's companion Titus. The third letter (*our* 1 *Timothy*) he addressed again to Timothy. Neither Timothy nor Titus are more than names representative of those who exercise authority in the Church. The date of 2 *Timothy* is about A.D. 95, of *Titus* about 100, of 1 *Timothy*, 105. Those who have already made careful studies of these Epistles will welcome the critical judgements of so mature a scholar on the many questions of composition and exegesis which have long been the subject of debate. They will note the use the author has made of the *Didascalia Apostolorum* and of *The Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus. That he should refer to such modern books as the Strack-Billerbeck *Kommentar* and Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch* goes without saying. The appendix on studies of such words as 'Bishop', 'deacon', 'elder', 'faith', etc., will be of value not only to scholars, but to the general reader, whom the author has in mind throughout. Neither in these studies nor in the commentary itself is a knowledge of Greek essential to the reader, who will find here much that will illuminate the history of the Church about the end of the first Christian century, and much that is relevant to important questions of today.

F. BERTRAM CLOGG

John Company at Work, by Holden Furber. (Harvard University Press, via Oxford Press, 32s. 6d.)

This is not everybody's book. Here is a minute and painstaking examination of the ledgers and commercial correspondence of the East India Company from about 1780 to 1790. Professor Furber isolates the economic factor, and confines himself to looking into the accounts of the English, French, Dutch, and Danish Companies trading into the East Indies—and, most of all, into those ledgers and letters kept in such intimidating voluminousness at what we used to call The India Office. The writer is not daunted by the magnitude of his material, and one cannot give sufficient praise to the zest, diligence, fidelity, and perseverance which he brings to the task of examining this mass of records. A reader, however, who is not prepared to consider the details of innumerable trading transactions and calculations based upon invoices and bills of lading, 'respondentia' bonds and bills of exchange, will not get very far with this book. Professor Furber does give us some thumb-nail sketches of humanity to lighten his exhaustive analysis of figures. He has done a true service to the student of Indian history by making plain to him that behind the ambition of princes and peoples, and the tale of battles and political intrigue, there lies an economic impulse and activity, the trader's pursuit of gain. Of course Professor Furber describes, in his chosen decade, the broad and overt stream of the Company's own commerce, but he gives much more space to the 'private' trade, both licit and illicit, which went along with it. The Company accorded to the officers of East-India men and to their own servants the 'privilege' of bringing or sending home Indian commodities in appreciable quantity; and there was also the activity of those 'interlopers', who carried on their operations and made fortunes in defiance of the Company's legal monopoly. These men developed a 'country trade', both within India itself and with adjacent countries of the East, in which some of the Company's servants also participated, to the neglect or even detriment of their Master's interests. There was greed and corruption, the concealment and falsification of accounts, and sometimes, though perhaps not often, the robbing of the Indian. And yet it would be a vast mistake to suppose that what Professor Furber has written is all, or even the chief thing, to be said about John Company. His chosen decade follows hard upon the

worst period in the Company's history. Here was a trading corporation which suddenly stepped into political power with some lamentable consequences. The Regulating Act of 1773 and Pitt's India Bill began Parliament's work of disentangling one function from the other, and Warren Hastings and Cornwallis were their first ministers. In that capacity we catch but fleeting glimpses of them in Professor Furber's narrative. It requires much more than commerce and the economic motive to account for the British *Ráj*. E. W. THOMPSON

Les Premières Confessions de foi Chrétiennes, by Oscar Cullman. (Presses Universitaires de France, Fr. 100.)

This is a small but valuable book by a Professor at Strasbourg who is well known for his studies of primitive Christianity. He is concerned with the prehistory of the Creeds, and how and why the Church came to elaborate its formulas. There was need, among the masses of early Christian literature, for a short summary and norm. Professor Cullman's chief conclusions may be named. He shows that five circumstances simultaneously gave rise to confessions of faith—*Baptism*: 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God' (Acts 8), 'One Lord, one faith, one baptism'; *Liturgy*: 'Christ died for our sins' (1 Corinthians 15), 'Every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord'; *Exorcism*: 'In the name of Jesus Christ' (Acts 3); *Persecution*: 'Christ Jesus who before Pontius Pilate witnessed the good confession', 'If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord'; *Polemic*: 'Jesus Christ is come in the flesh' (1 John 4), 'One God, the father . . . One Lord, Jesus Christ'. Under the multiplicity of formulas there is unity of dogma. Most of the earliest confessions have one article, which is christological. A few add faith in the Father, chiefly for pagans; these are as old as the former. Trinitarian confessions are at first rare. But in all Christ is central. Faith in God comes through Christ, for He is named as Father of Christ. The Spirit spoke of Christ by the prophets; He comes in baptism, and through this rite the third part of the creed was added. It is unfortunate that this addition led to the separation of forgiveness of sins from faith in Christ. Other elaborations tended to displace the centre of gravity from Him. The essence of the Christian confession is that Christ is Lord. He has overcome the world and the spiritual powers. The creeds are not merely historical, nor yet adventist. Christ reigns now: *Kyrios Christos*.

E. GEOFFREY PARRINDER

The Beloved Community, by Roger Lloyd. (Latimer House, 7s. 6d.)

Civilization and Religious Values, by H. D. A. Major. (Geo. Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.)

Here are two short books which treat of the relevance of Christianity to the present-day world. Canon Lloyd deals with the 'immemorial dilemma'—individual *v.* community, and suggests that the Church reveals the way out of it. There is a tension between individual and community which can only become 'creative' when both acknowledge a common goal outside themselves and together work for it. Failure to do this results in either slavery or chaos; history, past and present, supplies instances of this failure. History also supplies instances of attempts at achieving a 'creative level of tension'. The Hebrew people emphasized community, yet brought forth numerous outstanding individuals; Jesus emphasized the worth of the individual, yet founded a community. The Church emphasizes that both individuals and community have an eternal significance, and before God are equal. If God is denied, the community will tend to become dominant and slavery will result; if God is worshipped, the inevitable tension between individual and community will be kept at 'a creative level', for freedom will be its keynote. That is what makes a community beloved. The individual must be free to join or leave, and the community free to accept or reject with a discipline and authority of a commending, not commanding,

kind. Only when the Church is truly a free community can she be effectively evangelistic. Her mission is to establish unity between individual and community, and between both and God. This she seeks to do through worship and above all through the proclamation of the Cross. The book has a timely message for today, though there is some confusion as to which communities are likely to be eternal, and moreover when the author says that the times in which we live are closely akin to Biblical ones, one may ask: 'Which?'

If quotations are a mark of excellence Dr. Major's Hibbert Lectures must rank high! One of the most important for his theme is Matthew Arnold's definition of civilization as 'the humanization of man in society'. This end is achieved, says Dr. Major, through a religion which seeks to establish right relationships—between God and man, and man and man. He tackles the question as to what kind of a religion our civilization needs. His answer is—one which will give unity to the world; one which is evolving and creative; one which is scientific—further defined as truth-seeking, hypothesis-using, experimenting, simple, attractive, practical. He claims that the religion of Jesus is such and is essentially a 'lay' religion—hence its appeal to the apparently irreligious. All this may be admitted, but the author is on less sure ground when he pats the so-called Nordic races (typified by the inhabitants of the Commonwealth and the U.S.A.) on the back and suggests that they are essentially Christian, and all that is needed is to get them to admit it. He can see no hope for the world 'if they refuse to lead' for 'there is none to take their place'. Who are the true Nordics? Yet this is a readable book, and its appeal for a reconsideration of traditional religious acceptances will meet with a ready response from those who agree with Whitehead that the principles of religion 'may be eternal, but the expression of these principles requires continual development'. Finally, to Dr. Major's six 'Ps' for religious education one might add, 'Personal', for only those who have a personal experience can teach religion; others merely talk about it. RAYMOND M. GOODALL

The Christian Understanding of History, by E. C. Rust. (Lutterworth Press, 17s. 6d.)

This book is an attempt to show that while the secular historian cannot discover the true meaning of history, even if he can discover any meaning at all, the clue to history, including secular history, is provided by the Christian Revelation. The book is divided into three roughly equal parts. In the first part, entitled 'Basic Principles', the author discusses secular views of history under the terms 'Naturalistic', 'Utopian', and 'Idealistic'. It is impossible that any of these views should be satisfying because they ignore the fact that man has lost his unity through sin, and so any knowledge he can have of ultimate truth is inevitably fragmentary. This applies no less to religion than to man's works in other fields. In the second part the author deals with 'The course of Salvation-History and its Eschatological Framework'. It is evident that a great deal of careful work lies behind this section, but it is probably the least valuable of the three because the works of Brunner, Niebuhr, T. W. Manson, Dodd, and others, to whom the author makes due acknowledgement, have made us familiar with the substance of its argument. It contains a survey of the history of the Covenant-people with particular emphasis on the remnant idea, passes to the coming of our Lord and the actualizing of God's will in Christ, and finally deals with the Parousia. The contrasts between the Hebrew idea of history as moving on to a final goal and the Hellenistic idea of eternity as above time and impinging on time, is well brought out, as well as the attempt of New Testament writers to find a synthesis of these two interpretations. In the third part the author wrestles with his main problem. He maintains that Christianity takes both time and eternity seriously, yet that, though time is real, it will eventually be superseded. The powers of the age-to-come have been made manifest in Christ and are now a permanent factor in present

historical processes. The meaning of history can only be seen from a super-historical point of view and at the Parousia it will be seen by all. In his study of secular history and fallen man Mr. Rust sturdily maintains the view that secular history is much more than a scaffolding for salvation-history. Though 'the image of God' in sinful man is disastrously marred it is not destroyed. Man's creative works and his reason are evidence of this, but man's 'God-almightiness' leads to the demonization of his greatest gifts. The 'end' will not mean the destruction of man's highest achievements but the fulfilment of them. They will have their place in eternity. Many living issues are dealt with in the course of the book. What the author has to say about Judgement, Sin, Demonism, the Wrath of God, the Resurrection of the body and many other subjects is well worth reading. It is amazing that Mr. Rust should have mastered so much material during a busy pastorate and he is to be congratulated on his achievement.

PERCY SCOTT

Theories of Welfare Economics, by Hla Myint. (Longmans, Green & Co., 15s.)

This book is not a book for economic babes and sucklings, not even for folk in industry and commerce, but only for those reasonably well versed in the history of economic science and doctrine from Adam Smith till today. Yet it is not a straightforward history of economic doctrine. Rather is it a critical review of certain trends in economic discussion, directed to a fundamental problem of the very nature and purpose of industry. The author, who is Professor of Economics at the University of Rangoon, acknowledges indebtedness to J. R. Hicks of Manchester, as also to Hayek and Robbins. These names give some slight indication of the school of economic thought to which he inclines. What, then, is the problem to which the book is addressed? As the title shows, Dr. Myint deals with 'Welfare Economics.' This, he says, by its nature, is concerned with the efficiency of the economic system. An historical study of it, such as this is, therefore develops into a *practical estimate of the relative usefulness of different theories of welfare economics*. So we get a review that runs from Adam Smith by way of Ricardo, Malthus and Mill to Marshall and Pigeon, to end with Hayek, Robbins, Hawtry and Clark. By what criterion are these various theories tested? Many are possible, says Dr. Myint, but he has severely restricted himself by taking a purely quantitative one *free from value judgements*. He grounds himself, that is to say, on economics as a science and not primarily an art. Economic welfare, for instance, he defines 'as consisting in the satisfaction of *given* individuals' wants, postulating that comparisons of economic welfare must proceed under the assumption of *constant wants*, and that once the system of wants has changed, the problem is not one of *economic* welfare but of *general* social welfare, which cannot be analysed in purely scientific and quantitative terms'. This self-imposed limitation pursues Dr. Myint to the end. He acknowledges that he is concerned with 'the size' of economic welfare only, that is, with how much is produced. He therefore does not discuss the way in which economic welfare should be distributed between different individuals, because he feels that there is very little that can be said on the subject in a strictly scientific way without introducing value judgements. Yet he is constrained to admit that, speaking for himself, he is convinced by the arguments of Professor Pigeon and Mr. Lester that economic welfare would be increased by a transfer of income from the rich to the poor. He nevertheless adheres to his judgement that these arguments involve interpersonal comparisons of ability and cannot therefore be regarded as scientific propositions. I myself confess to an incorrigible conviction that economics will never fulfil its true function until it faces the question: what should be the purpose of human industry if it is to serve the highest ends of human existence? This introduces the very valuable judgements Dr. Myint so resolutely seeks to exclude in the

interests of a scientific study of economics. For that reason, the most interesting chapters in the book to me were the two concluding ones where Dr. Myint, almost in spite of himself, was compelled to look toward a broader concept of welfare than the narrow one which he had set out to consider.

E. C. URWIN

Sociology of Religion, by Joachim Wach. (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 30s.)

What exactly is the Sociology of Religion? The task of Sociology is to make clear the tie or nexus which holds men and women together in social groups. It takes account, therefore, of the psychological basis of social life, notes the behaviour of men and women when they act in groups, inquires into the ethical ideas by which their actions are guided, and examines the ethical basis of social institutions. In what sense, then, can there be a Sociology of Religion? This is the inquiry on which Dr. Joachim Wach sets out in this volume in the International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction. Dr. Wach is a Continental scholar domiciled in the U.S.A., and his book is an expansion of an earlier work in German. Put briefly, his purpose is to inquire how religion helps human societies to cohere, what is the strand which religion contributes to the closely interwoven social nexus, and what is the bearing of the social groupings which religion creates on society in general. He writes: 'The author, a student not of the social sciences, but of religion, is convinced of the desirability of bridging the gulf which still exists between the study of religion and the social sciences . . .'; and 'Personal experience has aided the author in realizing the vital importance and significance of religion as an integrating factor in human society and in understanding its function in the contemporary crisis of civilization in East and West'. Dr. Wach immediately finds himself in conflict with the tendency, of which Marxian materialism is the most strident example, to describe religion as merely an outgrowth of social conditions, an ideological expression or reflex of its material or ideal interests. We are glad to see how firmly Dr. Wach repudiates this view and affirms the native independence and autonomy of religion, as a distinct and separate phase of human experience. This is one of the most commendable features of the book. For a working definition of religion he takes Rudolf Otto for his guide: 'Religion is the experience of the Holy.' Having made his starting point clear, Dr. Wach sets out to examine 'the effects of religion on the social life of mankind and of the influence of religion on the cohesion of groups, on the development and differentiation of social attitudes and patterns, and on the growth and decline of social institutions'. He briefly discusses religious experience and its forms of expression both in doctrine and in *cultus* and communion, individual and social. He passes to its sociological consequences, which he describes as twofold: a positive or cohesive integrating influence, and a negative, destructive, disintegrating influence. Contemporary religion shows abundant evidence of both influences at work. The bulk of the book is then devoted to a wide-ranging survey of Religion and Society. It deals first with the cases where the cult of religion is identified with a natural group (the family, the local group, the race or the nation), and then with the groups which religion specifically creates for itself (secret societies, mystery religions, founded religions and churches.) One chapter, devoted to Religion and Differentiation within Society, describes warrior, merchant, and peasant religions. Two concluding chapters of fascinating interest, 'Religion and the State', and 'Types of Religious Authority' (Founder, Reformer, Prophet and so on), end the book. The conclusion? Fundamentally and ultimately, religion makes for social integration, but social integration is not the 'aim' or 'purpose' of religion. Religion is sound and true to its nature only as long as it has no aim or purpose except the worship of God and Communion with Him. Its social consequences follow from that.

E. C. URWIN

The Church and the Social Order, by S. L. Greenslade. (S.C.M., 6s.)

Canon Greenslade has written a most useful little companion to Church history and has brought together in outline a good deal of otherwise scattered information. The Church is often criticized for 'doing nothing' and just as often for doing too much and meddling in other people's affairs! Yet there is often good evidence both for the Church's wise action and for its equally wise forbearance, and if admittedly there is also evidence the other way, the Church's own self-criticisms show where the balance of truth is to be found. Canon Greenslade's aim is evidential—to provide chapter and verse for the Church's relation to the social order right through the centuries, and his references are all scholarly and reliable. This should be a useful book of reference for youth groups. The fifth and last chapter, which deals with England, is on the whole a very balanced summary. Something more might have been said about the Quakers, and the Salvation Army is omitted. There ought surely to have been a place also for the association of the Primitive Methodists with the miners' unions. It is also an understatement to say that F. D. Maurice was 'influenced by the Oxford Movement'. He detested it! These, however, are small points, and we warmly commend the book itself.

A. VICTOR MURRAY

On Human Freedom, by John Laird. (George Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.)

These Forwood Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion, given in the University of Liverpool, are unfortunately Professor Laird's last gift. He died before the proofs were ready. In philosophical circles he will be greatly missed, for to the end he retained a freshness of mind, a freedom from both old taboos and current fashions, that made all his writings stimulating. Here he gives us, as usual carrying his learning lightly, a very helpful analysis of the problem of determinism *versus* indeterminism. He calls himself an 'undogmatic determinist', and the term expresses admirably the fairness of his thinking. An inveterate empiricist, he will not allow the sense or fact of freedom to be denied; and, having thought and written much on ethics, he will not have moral responsibility explained away. His task is to find room for these in a world organized in a causal way. He admits that determinism is neither self-evident nor empirically proved, but he inclines to it on the ground that it gives a speculative unity to our thinking about the universe. What he emphatically denies is that free action is to be defined as uncaused action, for he fears that if we deny causes anywhere we may be driven to deny them everywhere, which would mean intellectual chaos. He goes through all the puzzles of the problem patiently, yet without dullness. Theologically, for example, he observes that human freedom is compatible with divine omnipotence, but not if this is conjoined with omniscience and omniscience. I think it may be said that his book is the best available monograph in English on the subject. If his conclusion is unsatisfying, that may be because he, like the rest of us, continues to think in the usual thought-forms. On this problem, I am sure, we are waiting for a simple genius to break out into a new category or categories.

T. E. JESSOP

The Religious Basis of Education, by J. S. Ross. (National Children's Home, 3s. 6d.)

In 1948, the workers of the National Children's Home invited the Principal of Westminster Teachers' Training College to deliver their 'Convocation Lecture', and now, within these seventy pages, they publish his discussion of the part the Christian religion should play in Primary and Secondary Schools. His conclusion is profoundly simple. Religious instruction should be central in all education. For what, after all, is the purpose of education? The answer will depend on our idea of what constitutes 'the good life'. Philosophy, as Mr. Ross points out, has no sure answer. Only in the

Christian revelation is there a clear vision of what is good and the power to follow it. But the Christian way to the good is through the knowledge and worship of God in Christ, and we cannot achieve and maintain the Christian ethic without Christ. 'If Christian education does not result in making Christians, it fails!' Historically our Western civilization in its predominant characteristics derived from the Christian faith and impulse. Until the late nineteenth century it was Christian Churches and societies which provided schools and trained teachers because they saw the central spiritual purpose of education. Under the new order that vision is fading. The State, Church, home, and school alike, must recover if education is to fulfil its proper function. Mr. Ross suggests ways in which this can happen, until the whole of a school's life is permeated with the Christian spirit. But the key to education is the teacher. Only convinced Christians thoroughly trained and equipped are sufficient for such a task. Hence the need, not only that the Church should train its young people in its various ways, but that residential Teachers' Training Colleges should have a religious foundation. This book is to be commended to all who would clarify their thought concerning one of our most important modern problems.

RALPH KIRBY

Vedanta for the Western World, edited with an Introduction by Christopher Isherwood.
(George Allen & Unwin, 16s.)

'The counter-attack from the East' has become almost a major feature of modern civilization in the West, for it would be possible to compile an impressive list of Western intellectuals, from Schopenhauer to Aldous Huxley, who have fallen under its spell. The central formulization of Indian 'spirituality' is 'Vedantism', or 'the Higher Hinduism'. Its essence is a fusion of Absolute Idealism with religion. According to this religion, man's goal is to find reabsorption in the Absolute; but this only means a rediscovery of his own true nature, for the self in its reality is the Absolute, though it does not *know* it. The truest treasures of religion are, therefore, in the great Scriptures of Hinduism, the *Upanishads* and the *Bhagavadgita* and the rest, since in them alone is this doctrine taught with full explicitness. One of the sounder movements connected with this 'Higher Hinduism' is the Ramakrishna Mission. Its soundness has lain both in the great charm and deep experience of its major personalities, and in its admirable balance between spiritual and practical life. The volume under review is collected from recent literature of the Ramakrishna Mission in California. In its attitude to Christianity it is both moderate and enlightened. There is, indeed, the usual tendency to regard Christianity as a mere groping toward Vedantism, and to neglect the fact that Christianity insists that man and God are not identical, and that love of God in His family is not the same spiritual goal as mystic and metaphysical oneness with Him. In this book, moreover, the phrase *philosophia perennis*, a technical term in Western philosophy irrevocably wedded to theism, is used to describe Vedantism, which means confusion of language. Yet the book does contain a clearer recognition than usual of the fact that the great personalistic religions with historical Founders may have a genuine religious goal which is not 'unitative': and there is some recognition of an important point which is often slurred over—that the doctrine of *karma*, which is universal within the varied forms of Hinduism, is nowhere found outside it, and that this calls for some justification before Hinduism can be taken as the 'universal religion'. While, however, the book as a whole gives an able popular account of Vedantism, yet, as a collection of journalistic articles, it is rather scrappy, and often deals with great themes superficially. Perhaps the most appealing sections of the book are those which deal with the great men of the early days of the Mission. Christopher Isherwood's account of Sri Ramakrishna himself is a noble piece of writing. The hitherto unpublished lecture by Swami

Vivekananda has great charm, but contains too many of the mis-statements and half-truths about British rule in India which disfigured much Indian writing in his time. Aldous Huxley's numerous contributions are curiously disappointing: of his sixteen pieces one prose passage and one poem show the full sparkle of the genius of his youth; the remainder only illustrate the dullness which can descend upon a lucid and witty mind when it becomes obsessed with pretentious doctrines. We would commend this book to students in the West, and especially to Christian Ministers, to whose pastoral calling it is more relevant than would at first appear, for a simplified version of this *Weltanschauung* is the nearest that present-day English has to a national religion! The present reviewer when on furlough used to tell his congregations that they were nearly all Hindus—and after explanation they used to agree! He meant, of course, that the present British national faith in a 'summat sumweer', vaguely connected with ideals and decency and good fellowship and a little prayer, is more closely akin to the lower levels of Indian theosophy than it is to the religion of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. A Christian minister, therefore, who wants to realize just what his faith means in the intellectual climate of this age could do worse than think it out in the form of reply to Vedantism. Moreover, the East, as it is now itself telling us, has much to give the coming age. What its gift will be is not yet clear, but it will probably be easier to apprehend if we understand something of Vedantism.

J. F. BUTLER

Royal Pearl: the Life and Times of Margaret, Queen of Scotland, by A. M. D. Henderson-Howat. (S.P.C.K., 10s. 6d.)

This is an interesting story of an interesting person. Indeed, Margaret was more than that, for it was this saint who brought her country out of its Celtic backwoods into the orbit of the Roman Church and of Western civilization. She therefore has her place in history and is a worthy subject for historical study. This book, however, is not a history, but a work of piety, and it will edify only those uncritical readers who like their history romantic and romantically written. The authoress indeed warns us that 'in a biography no mechanism ensures precision' and under cover of this rubric she has taken care not to be precise. When Migne's *Patrologia Latina* is given *tout court* as an 'authority' no one would accuse the authoress of precision! And for references we have such helpful phrases as 'in the opinion of a recent writer' and 'the narrative of a later historian'—none of them verifiable. And it does not inspire confidence when one learns that at the court of Eadward [*sic!*] the Confessor Malcolm Canmore would read the *Gesta Romanorum*, a compilation which was not made till at least two centuries later! A sugary preface by the Bishop of Glasgow reveals the real aim of the book. It is an essay in Anglo-Catholic biography, designed to commandeer St. Margaret for the exclusive use of the Scottish Episcopate.

A. VICTOR MURRAY

The Reformation in Denmark, by E. H. Dunkley. (S.P.C.K., 13s. 6d.)

Those who saw the Danish Exhibition in the Victoria and Albert Museum will remember the memorable set of Gobelins, presenting Danish Kings set in characteristic pictures. Embroidered in each there was also a naïve poem, a remarkable piece of didactic German 'poetry', in which the King summed up the experiences of his life. Dr. Dunkley's book would have given great help as far as the kings of the Reformation period are concerned. The publisher rightly points out that there has been a tendency to neglect the Church History of the north of Europe. In fact, the book of Bishop Wordsworth about the Church of Sweden set an example which it took long to follow. Dr. Dunkley must be congratulated upon his book. It is well arranged. A first part gives the history of the Danish Reformation in three chapters picturing the

three successive kings between 1513 and 1559; a second part singles out certain important aspects of the movement and the leading characters connected with them. Some useful appendices with a full bibliography add to the value of the presentation. The author bases his record on the best literature available, mostly Danish, quoting his authorities wherever possible. Moreover he enables us to check his quotations by giving in the notes the originals. Mistranslations such as *a safe* (sea?) *voyage* for *hafzens fare*, the *dangers of the sea* (p. 121), are rare. There are misprints in the foreign texts, e.g. *formandleth* instead of *forwandleth* (p. 120). While this backing by authorities enhances the reliability of the book, it perhaps rather detracts from its freshness. In the second part, a Dane would certainly have devoted a full chapter to Petrus Palladius, but he might not have made the many comparisons with the contemporary English movement from Henry VIII onward, which will greatly help the English reader to set the Danish parallel in its right perspective. PETER KATZ

The Pattern of Methodism, by Stanley Brice Frost. (Methodist Youth Department, 4s. 6d.)

Henry Hosah Roberts, by Cissie Johnson. (The Epworth Press, 5s.)

Dr. Stanley Frost has successfully accomplished the difficult task of writing a theological text-book for modern youth in its own idiom, and in so doing has put into the hands of our young people a manual of instruction in the faith and life of the Methodist Church which they will delight to read for its own sake. His book is intended primarily for the use of young people who are being trained for membership in the Church. Those who work through it conscientiously and intelligently, preferably with the help of a qualified leader (for whose use a companion volume is shortly to be published), will become informed members of our Church, well qualified to give a reason for the faith that is in them. This book is a couple of generations overdue, but it has been worth waiting for, and its appearance synchronizes with the new emphasis upon adequate membership instruction. Can nothing be done to help youngsters of limited means to buy it?

Thousands of the people who flocked to the Cliff College Anniversary in the years before the last war will vividly remember 'H. H. R.' with his megaphone and white smock, and the admirable arrangements he made for their creature comforts. The story of the famous tea-tables upon which no spot of rain fell for twenty consecutive Whitmondays is but one of many remarkable triumphs of prayer and faith recounted by Mr. Roberts's daughter. This book is an answer to the sceptic, and a challenge to our modern prayerlessness and unbelief. 'H. H. R.' was an evangelist and a saint, one of 'Wesley's Veterans' in modern guise, and as long as Cliff College remains he is not likely to be forgotten.

WESLEY F. SWIFT

Praises with Understanding, by A. S. Gregory. 2nd Edition. (The Epworth Press, 12s. 6d.)

Commenting on the idea of a common Hymn-book for English-speaking worshippers, the writer of this book points out that music makes a distinctive contribution to worship, not least in Methodism. While this thought might have been more adequately developed, this book is a scholarly and valuable study of music in worship, by a writer who loves Our Lord and His Church. If anything can serve to remove the sad prejudice which blinds so many (including Choirmasters and Preachers!) to the worth of 'new tunes', this book surely will. It gives evidence of wide research and practical experience. It examines History, Theology, Poetry, Music, and in its study of omissions, re-admissions, and emendations in the text of hymns it is a significant

comment on changing phases of belief. One wonders, for instance, how many Methodist hymns of 'Repentance and Forgiveness' are in regular use. The writer appeals alike to the 'professional musician and the contented ignoramus', the conflict between whom is both sad and harmful. 'To learn why you like a thing is the best preparation for learning to like something else.' The book is balanced, unbiased and very comprehensive. The study of the 'good tune' is excellent. Speech rhythm chanting, to which the *Methodist Hymn-book* makes a great contribution, is shown to be beautifully simple—and simply beautiful. Future editions might profitably include reference to the mystic, spiritual power which finds expression in corporate singing. Methodism proclaims the reality of living 'experience' as well as adoration. The only omission in the study of varying topics is the 'chorus' type of hymn—a difficult topic, it is true, but one which cannot be ignored. As a scholarly musician's analysis of the *Methodist Hymn-book*, the book should both attract musicians of other Churches to the study of a truly great hymnal and inspire Methodists to discover new riches in their own treasury.

NOEL HUTCHCROFT

Service Book for the Young. (Oxford University Press, 4s. 6d.)

The 'Committee on Public Worship and Aids to Devotion of the Church of Scotland' offers here some sound work, for, if the result is somewhat ordinary, it is safe. There is no pomposity and no triviality, but good sound phrasing, which relates the daily round of youth to the Eternal verities. Sooner or later, adolescents must face the co-ordination of life, and if they then possess, in heart and mind, a wealth of noble prayers, and have learned that religion and life are not to be divorced, then all may be well. Such services as these may be more helpful in later years than the remembrance of rambling remarks to the Deity, as in a good many extempore prayers. It is good to acquaint young people with the time-honoured collects (and this book contains no new ones) and the appropriate response to the classic biddings and prayers. While a number of minor criticisms would occur to any reviewer, especially in the two 'united services', it is hardly possible to draw up a service-book commending itself to everyman, and to discuss detail, even if there were space, would detract from appreciation of a brave and worthy attempt to meet a real need.

HAROLD MALLINSON

The Dramatic Expression of Religion, by Eric Parsons. (The Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.)

We are witnessing a phenomenal revival of the amateur stage. Most work is becoming more and more repetitive and mechanical and even leisure is increasingly filled with mechanically supplied amusement. The amateur stage, combining many arts and crafts, offers welcome scope for the exercise of artistic and creative expression. Mr. Parsons shows that man is naturally histrionic. From remotest times he has expressed not only his artistic and creative urge, but also his religious sentiment and ideas in dramatic form. This is well illustrated from the Old and New Testaments. His swift survey of Greek drama is admirable. He also shows how profoundly the dramatic has influenced the development of Christian ceremonial—particularly in the Mass, so closely modelled on the dramatic ritual of the Mystery religions. For many centuries the Church restricted the Drama to liturgical uses. Under this régime it did not develop. While the Greek religion inspired the noble genius of Aeschylus and Euripides, under the medieval Church the Drama never came to its fine flower. When at last it found freedom it fell into licentiousness. In recent times, with Ibsen, Shaw, Galsworthy, and many others, it has come to a new depth and seriousness. Now, the possibility of a great future opens for Religious Drama. What shall we

make of it? The last chapter of this book on 'Present-day Tendencies' is wise, far-seeing, and stimulating. But the whole volume is as excellent as it is timely. This slender, closely-knit, suggestive book should be read and pondered by all interested in the Drama and its cultural use.

FRANK C. RAYNOR

Facing Life with Confidence, by Leslie J. Tizard. (Independent Press, 6s.)

This volume reminds me of a story told me by a friend who practised psychological medicine. Being asked to give three university lectures on Fear, he indignantly refused, but offered instead to deliver a series on Confidence. In her foreword Dr. Maude Royden remarks that there are few people who would not be helped by something in this book, and that many will be helped by every page of it. This praise is deserved. Here is no heavy treatise but an unpretentious little book which deals with grave issues and is full of practical counsel on life's everyday inescapable problems, as in their modern form they press upon us all. Such headings as 'Facing Life', 'Ourselves', 'Trouble', 'Temptation', 'Doubt', 'Old Age', 'Death', and 'Bereavement', show its scope. The central chapter on 'Facing Sin' is extraordinarily arresting and valuable. The author is Minister of Carr's Lane Chapel, Birmingham, and his fresh, sympathetic and bracing words are inspired by his experience as teacher and healer of souls. This is a wise, modern, realistic, and deeply Christian little book.

F. BROMPTON HARVEY

The Precious Secret, by Foulton Oursler. (The World's Work Ltd., 8s. 6d.)

This work has been written, as the author tells us in his preface, 'To help men and women to seek happiness—and to find it'. The firm confidence expressed in the last phrase marks every page of the book. The approach is psychological and tends to be preoccupied with the abnormal. But happiness is the concern of Everyman and should find its exposition in the normal. Mr. Oursler begins with the Beatitudes, the Charter of the Blessed, proceeds through arguments for belief in a God (interestingly illustrated from science), and then comes to what appears to be the chief purpose of the volume. This is to describe an important experiment in the psychology of the unhappy and the ill-adjusted, made in co-operation between the Psychological Clinic of Union College and the Sunday School of Westminster Church in Albany, New York. This section should be of interest and real value to all who have the handling of children. The remaining chapters are less absorbing, being loosely strung together to illustrate the general theme. The book seems to have been compiled rather than to have grown. The middle section, if brought within the reach of the many, would prove especially valuable.

FRANK C. RAYNOR

Cliffs of Opal, by F. W. Boreham. (The Epworth Press, 6s.)

Burning Leaves, by Derek Neville. (The Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.)

What, another Boreham! Yes, and as delightful in its freshness as another spring morning. All Dr. Boreham's zest for life; his wide, sparkling interest in people and things and books; his broad tolerance and his deep kindness of heart are to be enjoyed again in these pages. Read one of these essays in the morning and you will be lifted up. Read one of them in the evening, after the toils of the day, and you will be refreshed. Dr. Boreham compels his readers to savour his enthusiasms. He revives interest in half-forgotten things. Again and again the reader discovers himself reaching up to the top shelves for some neglected volume upon which Dr. Boreham has thrown a momentary but fascinating spotlight. He has an unerring instinct for whatsoever is lovely and of good report. He breathes a tender forbearance and a love

of his kind. He imparts to his readers something of his own enthusiasms and revives something of the freshness and the gleam of youth. This book is a tonic.

The second book is a choice little volume at the end of which one feels that rare regret that there is not more of it. It is deeply, arrestingly poignant. It contains eight little sketches of ordinary people in ordinary surroundings and brings out in clear, delicate tints the joy, the pity, the sadness, and the courage of ordinary people in everyday life. Mr. Neville entirely conceals himself in his quiet, pellucid prose and the natural development of his narrative. In *dénouement* he can be as startling as O. Henry; but his scenes have a gentler grace and a deep sense of the worth-whileness of life even amidst its sorrows. These stories would make ideal readings for Sisterhoods or fire-side 'circles'.

FRANK C. RAYNOR

The Personality of Jesus, by Wallace Deane. (The Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.)

It can only be said that this is a disappointing book. In the Publisher's note we are told 'Mr. Deane has endeavoured to analyse the personality of Jesus from the angle of Modern Psychology'. One is led to expect something fresh, even if one has a measure of doubt as to whether Psychology is yet sufficiently exact to warrant such a study. Yet, in point of fact, little follows that is new. It is true that the framework of the book is Psychological (even to a discussion of Our Lord's 'Ideational' (!) make-up), but the actual contents of the chapters are innocuous and hackneyed. The link with Psychology is a thin one, and would have been better abandoned in favour of an emphasis on the Devotional. Further, language is used without precision, and the reader is again and again frustrated by the substitution of rhetoric for clarity.

WILFRED WADE

She who Lived her Name, Mary of Providence, by Marie René-Bazin. (Mercier Press, Cork, 12s. 6d.)

A religious woman is the same, the world over, whatever be the Christian community in which she finds herself. That is the impression which a Protestant receives from reading this book. It is a tale of great interest and well told. It catches the reader's sympathy from the first, and makes of the acquaintance of this very real woman a very real experience. It unfolds the story of Eugénie Marie Joseph Smet from her happy home life at Loos near Lille to her death in the siege of Paris in 1871. She was only forty-six years old when she died, but had done a great missionary work in founding within the Catholic Church a new society for the deliverance of the souls in Purgatory. At every step of her way she relied upon Providence and was never disappointed. She lived to see her society established in Paris, in Nantes, in Brussels and even in far away China itself. All the deeds of mercy, so sacrificially done for the sake of the souls in Purgatory, had, for their immediate recipients the sick, the poor, and the needy in this present world. Of one of her spiritual daughters, a Chinese girl, it was said: 'Her charity endowed her with extraordinary insight and delicacy. The gentle spirit of Christ, easy to recognize in all lands, lived within her.' The feet of the followers of Mary of Providence were 'shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace' through the rescue of suffering humanity from the hell of this present life. It would be more than interesting to compare this Catholic saint of the nineteenth century with a Methodist saint of the eighteenth, Mary Fletcher of Madeley. For instance, Mary of Providence describes her arrival in Paris thus: 'When bedtime came Mlle. Molard set about getting my room ready. I was sitting dolefully in a corner by the fireplace, lost in my thoughts. "Why did I come?" I asked myself. "It's fantastic—no work could ever succeed in such conditions—how sad they must be at Loos! Would it not be better to go straight home?"' But the kindly Mlle. Molard made up

the bed of the embryo saint, although it had but three legs, and a cup of lime tea helped Mary of Providence through to confidence again. And Mrs. Fletcher, as Saint Mary Bosanquet, writes in her journal thus: 'At eight o'clock I reached my lodgings—I borrowed a table and a candlestick and the window-seat served me as a chair. . . . My maid being now come and having lighted a fire in the other room, and borrowed a few things of the family, she begged me to come into it, as the night was very cold. . . . As the bed was not put up, I lay that night almost on the ground; and the windows having no shutters, and it being a bright moonlight night, the sweet solemnity thereof agreed with the tranquillity of my spirit.' Both these servants of the poor died of cancer, but both still in the love of God. Is it not passing strange that Jesuit-controlled Mary of Providence, and the disciplined Methodist, Mary of Madeley, should be sisters under their skin?

G. ELSIE HARRISON

Some Victorian Portraits, by Hilda Martindale. (George Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.)

This is a gracious book. Here are twelve Victorian pen portraits made in retirement by one whose official career began as a Factory Inspector and ended at the Treasury as Director of Women Establishments. 'Always a firm believer in the ability and work of women,' Hilda Martindale 'spent much of her life fighting their battles,' yet here is nothing aggressive. She is as revealing with the five men she presents as with the women. All were interested in people, not just in good causes. They unostentatiously carried their Christian conviction into politics, social welfare, and administration. The royalties go to the Friendly Almshouses of which we learn in the portrait of Charlotte Spicer. First come family portraits: her Congregationalist mother, doughty defender of Free Church principles; Sir Albert Spicer, who compensated his fatherless niece in many understanding ways and always had time to listen; her aunt Charlotte, a born social worker, who took seriously the office of aunt to twenty-seven nieces and twenty-nine nephews, who found it hard to express affection, but was wanted more than anyone else in times of sorrow or trial. Then come colleagues: Sir Malcolm Delevigne, who gave his leisure to Dr. Barnardo's Homes; Sir Gerald Bellhouse, epitomized in the words 'Integrity' and 'Humanity'; Dame Adelaide Anderson whose vision and militant courage wrote an unforgettable chapter in legislation affecting women in factories; and Isabel Taylor, a dedicated factory inspector. Finally come some friends: Dr. Emily Elizabeth Fleming, the discerning physician; Rev. William Drury, an unconventional parson sure of his vocation; Rosalie Lulham, of Royal Holloway College, whose intellectual powers were matched by her perceptive spirit; and last, as vividly as any, Jemima Norton, a servant of the old school.

ELAINE HAMMERTON

The Cost of Discipleship, by Dietrich Bonhoeffer, translated by R. H. Fuller, with a Memoir of the author by G. Leibholz. (S.C.M., 9s.)

'A few, but only a few, of His followers are accounted worthy of the closest fellowship of His sufferings—the blessed martyrs.' Dietrich Bonhoeffer, one of the choicest spirits of the Confessional Church and a leader of the active Christian opposition during the Nazi's years of war-triumph, was shot by special order of Himmler six days before the Allies over-ran his prison. Sentence after sentence in what the Bishop of Chichester soberly calls 'this marvellous book' compels our attention because the author lived and died as finely as he wrote. Here is the German who gives the lie to Lord Vansittart. Here is the German who expounds the New Testament as a book new and strange and frightening. His insistence that each must endure his allotted share of suffering and rejection reminds us that preparation for suffering was, according to Selwyn, part of the catechetical teaching of the Early Church. The book

attempts to state the true relationship of disciple and Lord, and to delineate the pattern set out in the Sermon on the Mount. Its approach is characteristically Lutheran, as in its able exposition of the phrase '*pecca fortiter*', but its aim is to repair a weakness of Lutheran teaching on the nature of the sanctified life. Possibly Bonhoeffer's ministry in this country and his wide ecumenical contacts influenced him at this point, and certainly the political situation in Germany drove him from the Erastianism which had sheltered earlier generations there. As Biblical theology this book demands close attention: as the word of a very great Christian it makes us search our hearts afresh. The translation is competent and unobtrusive, though something is amiss with the reference to Marcion on p. 104, and it seems pointless to resort to the clumsy and misleading Prayer-book version of Psalm 109^a (p. 127); but these are minor blemishes. Mr. Fuller has done us all a service. S. B. FROST

Bristol Fashion, by Hugh Redwood. (Latimer House, 15s.)

This autobiography is a racy, humorous, and often deeply moving account of how a Bristol lad entered 'a calling which is one of the finest schools of unbelief in existence' and eventually found in it extraordinary opportunities for Christian Evangelism. His father was Chief Reporter of the *Western Daily Press*, and Hugh served under him for seven years before coming to London on the Central News Agency. The chapters describing his experiences there, and later as Foreign Editor and Night Editor of the *Daily News*, are full of thrills, the high spot being the story of how he handled the news of Scott's ill-fated expedition to the South Pole. The art and craft of agency journalism involves compressing much into little: 'The ability to recognize essentials, and to communicate them in such a way that a story highly condensed can be accurately reconstructed.' No wonder the writer says that a course in such journalism 'would be a splendid thing for any preacher'. Though he didn't know it, he was undergoing excellent preparation for his later career as a writer of 'one-minute sermons'. That is one of many examples of the remarkable 'ship-shape' patterns of a life in which each successive development has prepared the way for fruitful Evangelism. Even tragic experiences—and they were bitter indeed—led to triumphs of prayer and faith. The human stories of Hugh Redwood's Bouverie Street 'Clearing House', bringing help to the needy, and the records of remarkable answers to prayer, offer a tonic to the spiritually weary and a challenge to us all. Preachers especially should read this book. Hugh Redwood was brought up by his journalist father on the maxim: 'It is the news that matters.' For the last fourteen of his forty-three years in Fleet Street he has concerned himself only with the Good News that matters most. R. G. BURNETT

A Short History of Jewish Art, by Helen Rosenau. (James Clarke & Co., 15s.)

Helen Rosenau's clearly defined purpose in this short history is to elucidate the main characteristics and tendencies of Jewish art from its beginnings in the Middle East, through the various stages of its penetration of Europe, the British Empire, and the U.S.A. The subject is a large one, and Miss Rosenau's treatment of it is, in her own words, 'selective rather than comprehensive', as is shown in part by the omission of any reference to music, literature, or the drama. Her study is mainly concerned with architecture, and in particular the architecture of the Synagogue. 'Jews', writes Miss Rosenau, 'have always been interested in architecture, in abstract ornament, in the world of the Seen as the symbol of the Unseen.' This is the yardstick by which she measures not only the architectural development itself, but also, as ancillary to that development, Jewish painting and sculpture. The story of the development of Jewish architecture is of great interest and importance because it reflects in so many ways not only the religious life of the Jewish people themselves,

but also the varying degrees in which their life as a community was influenced for better or worse by its environment. The curious distortion seen in some of the illustrations of mediæval Synagogues, for example, shows how small buildings were erected, or adapted, in restricted areas with an eye to the possible need of protection from outside attack as well as the requirements of worship. In Western Europe, and more recently in the U.S.A., on the other hand, the more spacious and elaborate buildings reflect both the greater security of the Jewish communities and the considerable influence of non-Jewish architectural forms. The book, which is generously illustrated, contains a wealth of detailed information of great interest on a wide range of subjects within the general scope of its author's intention. I put it down, however, with the feeling that Miss Rosenau's own estimate of its merit as consisting 'in its suggestiveness rather than in its completeness' is very much to the point, and in the hope that she will feel able at some later stage to develop more fully the work she has begun so well.

WILLIAM W. SIMPSON

Sophocles: Oedipus at Colonus, translated into English rhyming verse with Introduction and Notes by Gilbert Murray. (George Allen & Unwin, 5s.)

Whilst admiring Professor Murray's scholarship and dexterity as a translator, some readers will regret his archaisms. The use of 'doth', 'know'st thou?', 'hitherward', 'meseems', and so on, makes the drama seem to a modern ear not so much ancient as artificial. Of course it may be argued that the language of Greek tragedy, particularly in this play, produced years after the Sophoclean style had been outmoded, sounded archaic to an Athenian. But even in 402 B.C. the literary tradition it represents was still alive in a sense in which the Georgian, even Swinburnian, style of Professor Murray is not alive today. On the credit side, however, he no longer enlivens the diction, as he did in his early translations, by adding vivid images absent in the Greek—and so substituting the strength of rhetoric for that of economy. This restraint is pure gain. Until somebody like Mr. Louis MacNeice or Mr. Rex Warner attempts a rendering (and this play is far harder to make lively in English than the *Agamemnon* or *Medea*), younger readers must forget their sensitiveness to archaisms and accept Professor Murray with grace. It will be enough for their elders that this translation is well up to his admirable standard.

W. G. FINDLAY

The Legend of Glastonbury, by A. G. Chant, decorated and illustrated by Horace J. Knowles. (The Epworth Press, 10s. 6d.)

Suspended Chords, by R. Scott Frayn. (The Epworth Press, 3s.)

Glastonbury has often provided a setting for English song, and its associations with Arthurian Legend and the traditional planting of the Flowering Thorn by Joseph of Arimathea are well known. Few people will be aware of the fainter legend that Jesus, as a boy, accompanied His merchant kinsman, Joseph of Arimathea, and came to our shores in a trading vessel. The verse and the boldly drawn illustrations are well matched in this beautifully produced book. Mr. Chant varies his measures and builds up the narrative by impressions conveyed in a series of short poems. These range from the tripping song of children:

*The wind in our faces,
The heather at our feet,
How close the heavenly places
With earth so young and sweet.*

to the wistful questioning of Joseph, Mary's husband:

*Dost thou remember, Mary, how the lad
Would sing upon his morning way to school?*

The book ends with the return of Joseph to the Mendips after the Resurrection, 'bent with the weight of years,' and the miraculous blooming of his staff. Behind the making of this book there lies deep grief, for it is dedicated to the author's son, 'William Morton Chant, R.A.F., and his crew'. All royalties will be devoted to the R.A.F. Benevolent Fund.

Dr. R. Scott Frayn is well known as a versatile Methodist minister. His *Suspended Chords* reveal him now as a writer of lyrical poems religious in theme and original in treatment.

*We weave, O Lord, for Thee
The frailest filaments of dreams disdained.*

One long poem, 'Emmaus', is in blank verse, and opens to us the fears and suspense of the two disciples who went that way until

*Their senses, smitten now with one swift glance •
More than the living brain can bear, succumbed,
With cry that rent the spell-bound air—"The Lord!"*

Some of the poems, such as 'The Prodigal' and 'The Centurion', are definitely related to themes in the Gospel, while others show the author's swiftness of response to scenes and incidents that impressed him. For instance, the sight of a children's service on the beach at Abersoch is caught in these lines:

*White sails are on the waters, at the oars men strain their thews,
Old age is by the idle boats, the lover at the verge.
The devout have built a pulpit and a choir of pebbled pews.*

Methodists who know Dr. Scott Frayn will welcome this further fruit of his ministry.

HAROLD S. DARBY

From My New Shelf

BY C. RYDER SMITH

Recovery of Man, by F. R. Barry. (Nisbet, 8s. 6d.)

In this book the Bishop of Southwell leads his readers from the current failure of Humanism to the Cross and Resurrection of Christ. He is a skilful money-changer, turning the currency of 'the schools' into the currency of 'the street'. But he does not believe that even a Humanism without Christ is altogether bad, and urges that there is a Christian Humanism, and that the two can go some way together. He thinks that there was advantage in the nineteenth-century alliance between the two kinds of Humanism, and even that the alliance ought to be revived. I don't find him altogether consistent here, though perhaps the apparent inconsistency is only verbal. On the one hand, the Bishop can say that the former kind of Humanism is 'a weak ally to be succoured', that 'it is unrealistic to imagine that the Church alone can turn back the (present evil) tide', and that 'the great task of the Church in this savage era is the rehabilitation of Humanism', apparently meaning non-Christian Humanism. On the other hand, he says that 'where Humanism is left down and out, Christianity can go on alone', and, having often quoted Mr. Lewis Mumford with approval, he tells him at last that *his* Humanism can never succeed. Why 'rehabilitate' the inherently impotent? But the Bishop is unerring in his main theme. He is thoroughly abreast of the theological movement of today, and can see, for

example, what is true in Barthianism without accepting it as the whole truth. He has many a happy metaphor and many a searching comment. He sees that 'the Welfare State' has come to stay, in some form or other, but he urges that 'no State can give us security against sin, with the ruin and misery it brings'. And he knows that because Jesus rose from the dead, mankind may be saved from its present 'death' through sin. Here is the one way of 'recovery'.

Law and Love, a Study of the Christian Ethic, by T. E. Jessop. (The Epworth Press, 6s.)

This is a new edition and not just a reprint. 'The text has been revised, and a chapter added on the religion of love within which the morality of love finds both its justification and its practicability.' The added chapter accuses the British of the heresy of making religion the tool of ethics, and shows how in Christianity, because religion bases on the Incarnation, ethics are only one of its life-wide consequences. Prof. Jessop here shows his mastery of the use of words and of theology, as well as of ethics. The book is a successful and much-needed study of the fundamental issue in Christian ethics.

The Fourth Gospel as History, by A. C. Headlam. (Blackwell, Oxford, 7s. 6d.)

When Bishop Headlam died at eighty-five he was busy with a volume of 'Introduction' to the four Gospels. Among the material there was an 'unrevised' draft of the part on the Fourth Gospel which is now published along with a chapter on 'The Historical Value of St. Mark's Gospel'. Under the Fourth Gospel there are chapters on its purpose, historical value, authorship, and teaching. The Bishop takes a very conservative position, but (apart from the omission of the papyral evidence) he shows himself thoroughly abreast of recent scholarship. Needless to say, he can be pungent! One may note that he believed that the incidents in 'John' are historical though they are not arranged chronologically, that Zebedee *may* have been a priest, and that Peter was not present at the raising of Lazarus. For the rest his findings may be left to the experts. There was room for an up-to-date account of the conservative position. The volume begins with a 'biographical essay' by Agnes Headlam-Morley. It deals with the life of this son of Teesdale, only mentioning his books in passing. There is full acknowledgement that Headlam could be brusque. But he also loved gardens. I only met him two or three times, but I once heard him say, of course *cum grano*: 'I only know one woman who has a mind!' When he gave the name, it was clear that he *meant* a woman with a *will* as strong as his own. This biographical essay is very welcome, especially for its picture of Headlam's early life. A pencil-drawing by Francis Dodd matches it very well.

The Church's Ministry, by T. W. Manson. (Hodder & Stoughton, 6s.)

The Bishop of Oxford's symposium on *The Apostolic Ministry* has 'set the ball rolling'. In this book Professor Manson replies to it, though for the most part indirectly. Once, indeed, he justifiably turns aside to point out that Church history 'gives the lie direct' to the claims underlying one of Dr. Kirk's statements, but his chief purpose is to urge that the ministries of all the Churches bear the marks of Christ's own ministry, spite all imperfections. For Dr. Manson 'the Church's ministry is the continuation of the Messianic ministry of Jesus and it is the Church itself that is "apostolic"'. There are four lectures in the book, the last being the C. J. Cadoux Memorial Lecture. For the most part Dr. Manson restates the well-known Free Church position, though he does it in his own way. There is a brief survey of the varying forms that the ministry took in the first two centuries and a half. At one point, however, Dr. Manson treads new ground. In *The Apostolic Ministry* the Greek term *apostolos* is taken, probably rightly, to be a translation of the Aramaic word *shaliach*, and an appeal is made to Rabbinic use of this term. Dr. Manson gives a careful and thoroughly

documented survey of the evidence in the *Mishnah*, etc., and shows that the *shaliach* did not and could not hand on his functions to others. There was no 'succession'. Is it mere 'wishful thinking' to suggest that the scholarship of the last seventy years or so has made it more and more difficult to hold the High Church position?

The Church of Rome, a Dissuasive, by Richard Hanson and Reginald Fuller. (S.C.M. Press, 8s. 6d.)

This book has been written by Anglicans for Anglicans, but this gives it an added interest to others. The writers are clergymen who have a message to those of their own Church who are tempted to 'look toward Rome'. They are very careful both to do justice to Rome and to admit the short-comings of their own Church. In an account of the ways in which the Roman Church sets an example to others, some will think that they are over-generous. For instance, how far is the ordinary Mass, where only the priest partakes of the elements, a true Eucharist for the other worshippers? In describing their own Church the authors prefer the term 'synthesis' to 'moderation' or 'compromise' or 'comprehension'. They claim that it accepts what is true in Lutheranism and Calvinism, but hold that these Churches have not done justice to 'the organic unity between Christ and the Church', plainly believing that a continuity in episcopal ordination is a necessary element in this unity. Their references to the Free Churches are only sporadic. One could ask a question about a phrase here and there, but it is good to 'see ourselves as others see us', even though it is true that no one can fully understand the *ethos* of a community to which he himself has not belonged. This book not only fulfils its 'dissuasive' purpose, but ably depicts the *via media* of the central Anglican tradition. A large place is given to an examination of Newman's account of the development of doctrine. The perspective of the book is noteworthy. Hardly anything is said, for instance, about Rome's doctrines of grace and merit. It is her claim to infallibility, with its concomitants, that attracts Anglicans and some others.

The Congregational Two Hundred, by Albert Peel. (Independent Press, 10s. 6d.)

This book is a kind of Congregational *Who was Who?* except that it characterizes as well as describes. It starts with Richard Fitz in 1571 and ends with Frank Knox, who died in 1944. It is a book to 'browse' in, and, as I browsed, I made a few notes. Here are some of them—'Among the large Churches the Congregational and Baptist Churches are unique, for they were not founded by great men', 'There seem to be no names except from Britain and North America', 'There are few women in the list', 'Congregationalism in Scotland is said to be "weak", but it has bred many mighty men', 'What a multitude of great preachers Congregationalism has produced!', 'This is a kind of history of Congregationalism—and a good kind', 'Everything that is distinctive of Congregationalism springs from one root—its doctrine of the Church—but the harvest is great', 'It is good to know something of other men beside the greatest', 'Dr. Peel does not eulogize overmuch'. I began to make a list of particular names—and quickly struck on the great triad, Milton and Cromwell and (perhaps) Bunyan—but it soon appeared that 'the time would fail me to tell'. And after all, is it not best that every man should do his own 'browsing'?

The Dilemma of the Arts, by Wladimir Weidlé. (S.C.M., 10s.)

Our debt to the group of exiled Russian scholars whose centre is Paris keeps growing. They share two characteristics. They have all made a wide and deep study of Western civilization and not least of its manifold individualism; they all, none the less, retain the belief of the Russian Orthodox Church that society counts for more than the individual. Perhaps the best-known instance of the latter belief is its application to the doctrine of the Church itself, under the term *sobornost*, but this is far from the only

application. In this book Professor Weidlé applies it to aesthetics. As usual now, he finds the origin of our present ills in the Renaissance, but he thinks that in the arts the evil results did not begin plainly to appear until 'The Romantic Revival'. It was then, he claims, that the slow dying of art became obvious—though even after that there were struggles for life, notably in the French painters. Here I am unable to check his findings, and no doubt there are 'aestheticians' who will challenge them—or at least some of them—hotly. But his range in English poetry is as wide. For instance, passing references to such writers as Beddoes and Chatterton and Synge show that 'he knows'. He gives extended attention to Sartre and Joyce and Claudel. His fundamental charge against modern art is that it is trying to live without roots—which means that it has to 'substitute construction for creation'. At the Renaissance, art not only cut itself free from the control of the Church, but from religion. Professor Weidlé traces the results (with some inevitable repetition) under a kind of mounting series of subjects—'The Great Refusal', 'The Loss of Style', 'Pure Poetry', 'Abstract Art', 'Loneliness', and 'Agony'. He is mainly concerned with criticism and analysis, but as his able translator, Father Martin Jarrett-Kerr, C.R., says, he not only diagnoses sickness but 'suggests a cure'. Almost his last sentence is, 'Art is not a sick man awaiting the arrival of a physician, but a dying man who hopes for resurrection'—and he sees some signs that there are artists who have learnt that resurrection can only come from God through religion. One could wish that Professor Weidlé had included another subject. He might have explained why art withered in Russia, which had no Renaissance, between 1500 and 1800 A.D. In spite of his earnest contention that dissection kills, he himself uses it effectively. Was not Russia short of skilled physicians? If she had had them, would Bolshevism have prevailed today? Are the exiles at Paris the fore-runners of a Reformation in the East? This is a very valuable book on the difficult but urgent problem of Christian aesthetics. It is full of judgements that go deep. It is academic but it transcends the academic. It opens with a reproduction of a very moving picture by Georges Rouault of the Agony in Gethsemane.

Francis Jeffrey of the Edinburgh Review, by James A. Greig. (Oliver & Boyd, 21s.)

As Dr. Greig says, Jeffrey is rarely remembered now except by the one sentence with which he began his criticism of Wordsworth's *Excursion*: 'This will never do.' In this book Jeffrey is set in his environment, and much evidence is given to show that he was both a very able and a very lovable man. Dr. Greig's purpose is not to justify him, but to do him justice. He shows how Jeffrey delivered criticism from servitude to book-sellers, and how unswerving a critic he was whether of friend or foe. But the chief subject of the book is an examination of Jeffrey's attack upon 'the Lakers' and the Romantic Movement in general. Dr. Greig has mastered the whole of the relevant literature, and builds up his case like an assiduous brick-layer. While some readers may find this a little tedious, it is probably the best way for Dr. Greig's purpose. It shows, for instance, what Jeffrey's canons of criticism were. At the end Dr. Greig draws his conclusions together in the claim that the Romanticists were, in modern phrase, 'escapists'. They fled from reality into an imaginative world—but many of them, and Wordsworth in particular, would not admit this. Wordsworth himself claimed to be 'nothing' if he were not a 'teacher' of the way to live aright. Dr. Greig claims that later history has shown that he was not—and who can deny this? Wordsworth had no adequate account of any kind of evil, still less of its cure. This is not to deny his greatness, but to show its limits. Jeffrey's mistake was in emphasis. He summarily admitted the greatness but spent his space and speech on the limits. Many later critics have, in effect, pointed out that after all there *are* ways in which the *Excursion* will not 'do'.

BOOKLETS, PAMPHLETS, AND REPRINTS

Ruskin, *Prophet of the Good Life* (Oxford Press, 4s.) contains seven addresses given at a Ruskin Society luncheon by Lord Samuel, the Minister of Education, and others. There are animadversions on Admiral James's book about Ruskin's married life. . . . In the *King of Glory* (The Epworth Press, 1s.) Gordon Rupp, as lively and acute as usual, has written a 'Manual of Fellowship' to introduce 'groupers' to the difficult Epistle to the Colossians. There are many 'modern instances'. A seasoned 'grouper' tells me that it is best to read the manual, then the Epistle, and then the manual again. *Verb sap.* . . . In *Infant Baptism Today* (Carey Press or Berean Press, 6d.) Dr. William Robinson shows by quotations how scholars in Protestant paedobaptist Churches are now affirming that New Testament baptism was 'believers' baptism' and how there is 'uneasiness' in the Anglican Church about 'indiscriminate baptism'. Dr. Percy Evans and Dr. Henry Townsend write respectively on the doctrinal and ethical issues involved. This is an able Baptist pamphlet which others need to weigh. . . . After nine years G. T. Salusbury's *Street Life in Medieval England* (Pen-in-Hand Books, Oxford, 8s. 6d.) is again available. It tells of streets as well as street life, and of 'expeditation' and 'dry stews' and 'the thew' and the ordering of life by bells of many meanings and the multifarious duties of every burgess, and so on and on—and it is documented *à la* Coulton. . . . Dr. W. R. Maltby writes little but always writes well. He has revised *The Significance of Jesus* for the 'Viewpoints' series (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.) There are sallies of salty humour, apt but uncommon analogies, and insight both into the mind of 'ordinary' men—and of Jesus. Yet all serve one end, the 'implanting' of the 'word that is able to save your souls'. . . . In *Contemporary Religious Jurisprudence* (Waldain Press, Chicago, \$2.50) Mr. J. H. Rubenstein collates the decisions of lawcourts in U.S.A. on fortune telling, faith healing (including Christian Science), and pacifism. There are a few references to early English law. . . . Muriel Lester's *Ways of Praying* (Independent Press, 1s. 9d.) is in its ninth edition. It is a guide to the treasure of the practicable for busy people who 'want to pray'. . . . *A Christian looks at Communism* (The Epworth Press, 3d.) by Edward Rogers, gives the ABC of our answer to Bolshevism. It is as clear and quiet as daylight. . . . Can any Christian shut his heart against the pitiful need of the refugees in Europe? In *Making Christian Fellowship Real* (Ecumenical Refugee Committee, 5 Sumner Place, London, S.W.7, 6d.) Henry Carter, keeping close to facts, shows how to help them. . . . There ought to be no slums, but it is possible to be a happy Christian there. In her new booklet, *Golden Splendour, Songs and Stories from Dockland* (The Epworth Press, 2s.), 'Mother' Elizabeth Macrea shows, in many a 'little' story and 'little' song, how the lives of 'humble' people may glow with the practice of I Corinthians 13 in mean streets. Her book is a cordial of the Spirit. . . . In *Western Civilization and Christianity* (S.C.M., 1s. 6d.), the Burge Memorial Lecture, M. Marc Boegner, leader of French Protestantism, first traces briefly but clearly the relations between the Church and Humanism till the Renaissance, then depicts their alienation with all its dire consequences, and concludes by showing how 'Amsterdam' began to face them. His watch-word is 'Christian Personalism'. . . . Mr. J. C. Whitebrook having claimed that Archbishop Parker was consecrated on or before 29th October 1559, Canon F. J. Shirley, in *Elizabeth's First Archbishop* (S.P.C.K., 2s.), has written a very strong defence of the traditional date, 17th December. The validity of the consecration is not here in question. . . . Here are two Lectures on Reunion by Anglican scholars: *Apostolic Succession and Christian Unity*, by Professor Leonard Hodgson (Friends of Reunion, 6d.) and *The Future of Anglicanism*, by Bishop A. E. J. Rawlinson (S.P.C.K., 6d.). Broadly speaking, the Bishop of Derby begins where the Professor ends, and, taken together, the lectures give an excellently clear account of the present position as Anglicans see it. The two writers' answers to the question 'What ought Anglicans now to do?' are not very dissimilar. . . .

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

Scottish Journal of Theology, December (Oliver & Boyd, 3s. 6d.)

- The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament, by G. Johnston.
- Missionary Communication, by William Lillie.
- Natural Theology and the Ministry of the Word, by Gwilym O. Griffith.
- The Idea of Substitution in the Doctrine of the Atonement, by F. W. Canfield.
- The Theology of Emil Brunner, by David Cairns.

The Journal of Religion, October (University of Chicago, via Cambridge Press, \$1.85).

- The Role of the Self-Evident in History, by Anders Nygren.
- Truth in the Theological Perspective, by Daniel Day Williams.
- God and the World, by William A. Christian.
- (Al-Hujwiri's account of) Spiritual Teachings in Islam, by Joachim Wach.

Die Zeichen der Zeit, Heft 9, 1948 (Evangelische Verlagsanstalt Gmb. H., Berlin-Weissensee, Parkstrasse 21, D.M. 1.50).

- Wir Heidenchristen!, by Otto Heinrich von der Gablentz.
- Die Bezeichnungen des Jahres 1948 für die evangelische Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands (1 Teil), by Martin Schmidt.
- Erbe und Verantwortung der Jugend, by Karl Barth.

Unterwegs, Heft 3, 1948 (Unterwegs Gmb H., Wolf-Diefer Zimmermann, Bln-Spandau, Seegfelder Str. 22, R.M. 2.00).

- The chief contents of this number are nine articles on different aspects of the Jewish problem, ranging from a discussion of the passage in the Gospels about the Syro-Phoenician Woman, with its reference to 'children' and 'dogs', to an account of the religious position in Palestine today.

The International Review of Missions, January (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.)

- A survey of the Year 1948, by the Editors.
- The Third Way: an Interpretation and Criticism of Amsterdam, by Karl Hartenstein.
- What Should a Missionary Know?, by Hugh C. Stuntz.

Bulletin of John Rylands Library, November (Manchester University Press, 2s. 6d.)

- St. Paul's Letter to the Romans—and others, by T. W. Manson.
- The Chinese Philosopher Mo Ti, by Harold H. Rowley.
- The Relations between Psychology and Sociology, by T. H. Pear.
- King John and the Papal Interdict, by C. R. Cheney.

The Expository Times, December (T. & T. Clark, 1s. 3d.)

- The Cleansing of the Temple in St. John's Gospel, by R. H. Lightfoot.
- Amsterdam: Church and Society, by Kathleen Bliss.
- do.: The Churches and the International Disorder, by Kenneth G. Grubb.

do., January.

- The Apocalyptic Discourse of Mark 13, by Vincent Taylor.
- The Temptation of Jesus, by A. Victor Murray.
- Romans 8²²: Text and Interpretation, by James P. Wilson.

do., February.

- Priesthood and Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity, by A. E. J. Rawlinson.
- Freudian Psychology, by J. G. M'Kenzie.
- The New Testament Doctrine of the Incarnation, by A. W. Argyle.

The Congregational Quarterly, January (Independent Press, 2s. 6d.)

- 'We Intend to Stay Together' (Amsterdam), by W. Cecil Northcott.
- The Churches in Exile, by Elfan Rees.
- The Congregational Idea of Freedom in the Socialist State, by J. Mills Phillips.

The Journal of Politics, November (The University, Gainesville, Florida, \$3.50 per annum).

- Acton as Historian and Political Scientist, by Herman Finer.
- The United States and the European Crisis, by Herbert von Beckerath.
- The European Polity: Biography of an Idea, by Andreas Dorpalen.
- The Political Ideas of Christian Democracy, by Gabriel L. Almond.
- The Politics of Social Pluralism: Some Reflections on Lamennais, by Robert A. Nisbet.
- Marxism and Free Parties, by Robert A. Dahl.

The Yale Review, Winter Number (Yale University Press, via Oxford Press, \$1.50).

- The British Colonial Territories, by A. Creech Jones.
- Boy-Man and Man-Boys (in Fiction), by Asher Brynes.
- The Pursuit of Peace through Understanding (UNESCO), by Richard McKeon.
- A New Letter from Fielding (to Richardson), by E. L. McAdam, Jr.
- France and the Future German State, by Robert Strauss-Hupé.

Our Contributors

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>W. LAMPLOUGH DOUGHTY
B.A., B.D.</p> | <p>Methodist Minister. Author of <i>John Wesley in Lincolnshire</i>, <i>John Wesley, His Conferences and His Preachers</i>, and <i>Studies in Religious Poetry of the Seventeenth Century</i>.</p> |
| <p>CHARLES GIMBLETT
M.A.</p> | <p>Methodist Minister. Special studies (Trinity College, Cambridge): Philosophy and Education. Formerly Assistant Master, Taunton School. First Head Master, Haigh College, South China. Author of <i>Pilot Prayers</i>, etc.,</p> |
| <p>F. BROMPTON HARVEY</p> | <p>Chaplain, during war years, at Wycliffe College, Gloucester. Bibliophile, and author of Church, State, and Letters. Contributor to <i>Times Literary Supplement</i>, <i>Contemporary Review</i>. Special interest in, and authority on, European history and French literature.</p> |
| <p>W. S. HANDLEY JONES</p> | <p>Methodist Minister. Poet, essayist, literary critic. Author of <i>The Unveiling</i>, and <i>Other Poems</i> and <i>It Crossed My Mind</i>.</p> |
| <p>J. E. PARRY
M.A., B.LITT.</p> | <p>Head Master, Bournemouth School.</p> |
| <p>B. M. G. REARDON
M.A.</p> | <p>Rector of Kelly, Devon; formerly Vicar of Holy Cross, Hornchurch, Essex. Educated Keble College and Ripon Hall, Oxford. Ordained priest 1938. Worked in Chelmsford Diocese previous to war service as Chaplain to the Forces.</p> |
| <p>C. RYDER SMITH
B.A., D.D.</p> | <p>Principal, Richmond College, London University, 1929-40. Professor in Theology 1932-40. President Methodist Church, 1931. Author of many theological books.</p> |
| <p>VINCENT TAYLOR
D.D., PH.D.</p> | <p>Tutor, Headingley College, Leeds (Ferens Chair of New Testament Language and Literature, and Classics). Author of <i>The Gospels: A Short Introduction</i>, <i>The Atonement in New Testament Teaching</i>, etc.</p> |
| <p>LESLIE D. WEATHERHEAD</p> | <p>Minister of the City Temple Church, London. Author of <i>After Death</i>, <i>Psychology in Service of the Soul</i>, <i>Psychology and Religion</i>, <i>Jesus and Ourselves</i>, <i>Transforming Friendship</i>, <i>The Significance of Silence</i>, <i>When the Lamp Flickers</i>, etc.</p> |
| <p>LEON EDW. WRIGHT
S.T.B., PH.D.</p> | <p>Associate Professor of New Testament, Harvard University, Washington, D.C. Associate Editor, <i>Journal of Religious Thought</i>. Degrees awarded, Harvard University.</p> |

